OKLAHOMA

Claude L. Hostetter, Clinton, Okla., in place of I. J. Loewen, deceased.

Clarence W. Phillips, Coyle, Okla., in place of G. E. Wandell, retired.

Alfred V. Koehler, Manchester, Okla., in place of B. E. Stone, resigned.

Robert Anderson, Sperry, Okla., in place of R. T. Holbert, deceased.

Oscar Renz, Weatherford, Okla., in place of J. M. Crabtree, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Grant M. Barrall, Wapwallopen, Pa., in place of C. D. Everard, transferred.

SAMOA

William F. Robison, Pago Pago, Samoa, in place of D. J. McMullin, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

George A. Curry, Elk Point, S. Dak., in place of T. H. Ryan, retired.

TEXAS

Lance A. Leggitt, Lakeview, Tex., in place of J. D. Durham, transferred.

Jesse B. Strickland, Novice, Tex., in place of M. R. Howard, resigned.

Irvin L. Hergert, Perryton, Tex., in place of M. R. Coffee, resigned.

John O. Bier, Plainview, Tex., in place of J. C. Terry, retired.

VIRGINIA

James L. Hale, Chilhowie, Va., in place of E. B. Sanders, transferred.

WASHINGTON

Rival S. Moore, Long Beach, Wash., in place of C. D. Mitchell, transferred.

WEST VIRGINIA

Henry E. Chapman, New Martinsville, W. Va., in place of J. O. Eakin, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Ruby C. Bahr, Fairchild, Wis., in place of R. R. Hoffman, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 17, 1948)

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Lord and our God, again we wait in the shadow of Thy holy presence, in which all alarms have been hushed. We entreat Thee to teach us the best way to see, the best way to reason, and the best way to act in serving society and the State.

Give to the Congress a great measure of moral courage as it meets all pressing needs; grant that its achievements may bear the mark of a patriotic and convincing faith and that its decisions may become prophecies of a better tomorrow. In our Master's name and for His sake. Amen.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further 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, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6771. An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment 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. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. REED, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; 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. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) entitled "Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

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

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two essays.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Red River of the North project and include letters, reports of hearings, communications, and newspaper articles.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast by Jack Bell entitled "Communism."

Mr. LOVE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Wheeling Intelligencer of June 17.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a quotation from the State Department and statements appearing in the Washington Star, and in the other an analysis of the Marshall plan in two instances.

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

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in two to include an editorial and in the third an address by the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, one concerning the Palestine question, and in the other to include a letter he is sending to some of his constituents.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in each to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. DOUGHTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed yesterday by the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the services of the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman of the committee.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written by him to a constituent.

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

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

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several clippings from various periodicals.

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

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

RECORD and include an editorial from the Montana Standard of Butte, Mont.

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

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one a newspaper article.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some telegrams.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the thirtieth observance of Lithuania's independence day. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $301.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I was granted permission to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram from President Truman, the speech of Dr. Frank Kingdon, sundry newspaper articles and pieces of correspondence, and the speech of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], in connection with a testimonial dinner recently given the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] in New York City. I understand that only a portion of this material was included in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that I again be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD as indicated, and that anything inserted in the RECORD in the previous extension be included in this insertion.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. PETERSON. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, our friends and colleagues from Florida, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE] will leave Congress at this session. They have both made very capable, conscientious legislators and Representatives. It has been my pleasure to serve with both of them during the entire length of their service. They have both fully cooperated with the Florida delegation in matters relating to the entire State and the national welfare. They have both been on the alert to represent the best interests of their respective districts. Great districts with diversified interests, they have been well represented in a critical period requiring hard work.

The Florida delegation, while small in number, has worked together as a team. These two, our friends and colleagues, have been an important part of that team, Representative HENDRICKS having served on the Post Office and Post Roads and on the Appropriations Committees, and Representative PRICE on the Post Office and Post Roads, Naval Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees.

Personally, and as chairman of the delegation from Florida, I rise to express my warm personal friendship and deep appreciation to them for their fine public service. We will miss them and we wish for them success and happiness in their future undertakings.

If I may depart for a moment from the use of formal language, I will say "Good luck, Little JOE. Good luck, EMORY. You both have made a good record. You will be missed."

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a prize-winning essay.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the prize-winning essay in the contest conducted by Drew Pearson on Democracy was written by Rev. Alfred J. Fisk, of San Francisco. It is as follows:

Democracy, like good music, does not need argument; it needs rendition. The best way to make democracy live, is to live it.

People are too much concerned about democratic rights; too little about democratic responsibilities. But the rights imply duties, and become empty unless practiced. Democracy is not a fact; it is a task. To make it live, we must:

1. Vote in every election—using our best intelligence, studying propositions and candidates.

2. Exercise our right of petition, letting our legislators and officers of government know our convictions.

3. Promote community meetings for democratic discussion of civic and world problems.

4. Work through "Good Government" leagues—exercising eternal vigilance that political performance match profession.

5. Do an honest day's work. Parasites or shirkers fail in their responsibility to a democratic society.

6. Treat every man in personal relationships as an equal—without prejudice and without exploitation.

7. Finally, democracy—like peace—is indivisible. The world cannot long continue half democratic and half totalitarian. To make democracy live here at home, our Nation and we as individuals must use our influence that it live throughout the world.

Democracy begins with the individual; it ends with the world. Each of us, you and I, your next-door neighbor and mine, must practice democracy. We must build little islands of functioning democratic life. The islands will grow and touch other islands, merging into greater units, becoming continents, becoming finally the world. If you and I, the last and least citizen, live democracy day in and day out, democracy will live.

HOUSING

Mr. KELLEY. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, all signs now point to this—the housing bill as proposed by the Republican leadership will contain no provision for slum clearance, no public housing, no veterans housing, no farm housing. The public interest is plainly ignored.

The legislative machinery is well lubricated to push through a bill minus these provisions. Has the leadership completely overlooked the disastrous effects of present housing conditions on our people? Thousands of families are forced to live in disease-ridden slums; other thousands compelled to crowd into one, two, or three rooms, with attendant unsanitary conditions. Children must spend much of the time out of doors for there is no room at home, thus fostering juvenile delinquency. Thousands of houses, even in our modern cities, have no inside toilets, running water, or electric lights. How now will this situation be relieved? Not by the Republican controlled Congress, I assure you.

Social justice will be attained some days for these people. The Nation will not and cannot permit such uncivilized conditions to exist. How about the health rate and death rate under such conditions? Do not the leaders recognize that our manpower strength is dependent upon healthful living conditions? Perhaps if all of our people could live under proper conditions of health and sanitation there would be no need to worry about communism. Much of our social unrest can be traced directly to slums, filthy and poorly constructed homes, and unsanitary conditions in and surrounding those homes. How long will it be until some united and earnest effort is made to eliminate all of such conditions? That is the question to be answered by the Republican leadership of the House. The people will answer it for them if no answer is forthcoming.

DEFENSE OF ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the primary importance of Alaska in the plan of national defense is not properly appreciated even today. We are in effect making the same mistake we did in the years preceding the assault by Japan. Perhaps we are compounding that mistake. Then the United States did nothing at all to prepare this highly strategic area against aggression from Asia. Now we are doing just enough to make Alaska a more tempting prize than ever. Since the close of World War II we have done far too little. We can only hope that we will not be too late in taking those prudent steps which sound common sense advises must be taken without delay.

A defenseless Alaska imperils the entire United States. If our air bases in the Territory were seized by an enemy power every major city in the United States would be open to attack. The industrial East could be bombed at will, as could Detroit and Chicago and the great cities of the Pacific Northwest.

In some ways it might have been better that we did nothing in Alaska than

to do the little we have accomplished in the last 3 years. Alaska now stands as tempting bait. Properly fortified, it could be an almost impregnable bulwark against attack from Asia and could provide the spring board from which a major offensive action could be launched.

There is imperative need not only for carrying out without further delay the program outlined by the Department of National Defense, but for enlarging that program. For months on end last winter construction work at the vital Alaska defense centers was halted because of lack of funds. Buildings needed now and which could have been completed and in use now are only skeletons because workmen had to be laid off when Army funds ran out. We cannot afford to gamble in that fashion.

Neither can we afford to concentrate all our efforts upon installations at Fairbanks and Anchorage. The Air Force has in Arctic Alaska only one field. It is located at Nome. Once seized by an enemy power it could be used as the base from which to launch crippling attacks upon our installations at Anchorage and Fairbanks. There is almost literally nothing to keep an enemy from across Bering Strait from entering Alaska in any numbers he chooses.

NEED FOR ARCTIC BASES

It ought to be a matter of high national policy to ring the Arctic with suitable defenses. In any event this would be desirable and even necessary. It becomes all the more so because of the possibility of the existence in the Arctic of an oil field of considerable dimensions. It is a matter of public record that the Navy is exploring the vast Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. Although no official announcement to that effect has been made, there is high hope that underneath the Arctic tundra, heretofore held valueless, may be discovered one of the great oil pools of the world. If oil is found there Alaska will be more than ever a prize. Now, aside from the small force based at Nome, there is no protection at all along the entire Arctic coast.

Construction there will take time; it will proceed under difficulties. We should not overestimate those difficulties. We should not rule out the Arctic as a land so hostile and forbidding in climate and terrain that men and machinery cannot operate there. It can be done. It has been done. On the Soviet side of Bering Strait great advances have been made in many fields. It would be foolhardy for us to fail to note this fact. It would be foolhardy for us to make assumptions which might prove false under the stress of war. Nations have perished because of their failure to be hardheaded and realistic. We must not commit any such mistake.

SIBERIAN DEVELOPMENT

I have said that the Soviet Government has not been remiss in proceeding actively with the development of Soviet Siberia. What has been accomplished there is simply astounding. In these latter days, of course, we do not know everything that is being done but the record is clear that a great industrial empire is rising across Bering Strait and that huge cities and great farming areas are growing up. This is in startling and sad contrast to our continuing neglect of Alaska.

Alaska is a rich land. I need not elaborate on that here. It has magnificent resources of ocean and land sufficient to support a great and prosperous population, yet its area of over 586,000 square miles contains fewer than 100,000 people. What is the situation in Siberia? There were to be found 14,000,000 persons in 1944 and it is estimated the population has increased by several million since then. In 1944 along the trans-Siberian railway there were seven cities with a population of more than 100,000 persons. It is obvious that in event of war producing urban and rural populations would be of major value militarily. In Alaska we have done far too little—in fact, we have done practically nothing—to implement the national defense by attracting a civilian population to Alaska. The need for such action has been repeatedly emphasized by President Truman and by spokesmen for the armed services. The President was aware of the national interest when in his special message to Congress last month he urged adoption of an integrated program to provide for far wider utilization of Alaska resources by a far greater number of people.

The map shows why the United States cannot contemplate the loss of Alaska without contemplating at the same time the possibility—even the probability—that disastrous blows would be struck at the heart of this Nation.

PROXIMITY TO UNITED STATES

From Fairbanks, Alaska, it is 4,100 miles to Moscow. But it is only 2,790 miles from Fairbanks to Chicago, 3,270 to Washington, and 3,255 to New York. The distance from Fairbanks to Seattle is only 1,525 miles. Thus, it follows that while United States aircraft would in event of war be too far removed for direct strikes at the principal cities of Europe, the Alaska bases, once captured by an enemy power, could be turned against us with devastating effect. Bombers are now in use which can fly 8,000 miles with a load of 5 tons of bombs. Thus, no important city in the United States is removed from bombing range of Alaska. The urgency of the situation grows even more apparent when it is realized that until about 2 months ago there were no combat troops in Alaska at all. Now, some combat troops—numbering about 10,000—have been sent to Alaska for training purposes. This is a step forward, but does not meet the needs of the situation. Combat troops should be stationed permanently in Alaska in numbers sufficient to insure, insofar as such insurance can be provided, that the Alaska bases could be held even under a lightning attack. On February 1 of this year we had only 7,500 Army forces and 8,700 officers and men of the Air Force stationed in Alaska. These included Army elements stationed in the Aleutian Islands—and, as a matter of fact, those spread throughout the length and breadth of Alaska. Army troops are the service type and are largely for the support of the Air Force.

Construction is tremendously expensive in Alaska. The cost of erecting buildings has been a matter of proper concern to the appropriate committees of this Congress. Perhaps some savings could be effected. It has been suggested that gains might be registered if construction were by means of competitive bidding instead of by cost-plus contracts. However that may be, it can be fairly stated that no matter what the present-day costs are the money must be spent. It must be spent in greater volume than has been the case during the last 3 years. To do otherwise leaves Alaska defenseless and thus the Nation under constant threat. I suggest that if sufficient money is not immediately available and if time does not permit it is better to have temporary housing so combat troops can be stationed in Alaska in suitable numbers than to leave Alaska unarmed. First things must come first.

GENERAL TWINING CONCERNED

In a recent magazine article, Lt. Gen. N. F. Twining, commander in chief of the United States Army in Alaska, called attention to the needs and problems of Alaska when he wrote:

Alaska and the Aleutians must be retained as the forward bastion of our defense. Bases for long-range heavy-bomber units must be developed, inasmuch as Alaska is primarily a theater for long-range, heavy-bomber operations. These bases must be adequately staffed, even though there is a current overall shortage of personnel that seriously affects all planning for the peacetime Air Force.

No effort to conquer the problems presented by Alaska can be too great. The late Gen. Billy Mitchell said, "Whoever holds Alaska will hold the world." To fail to develop this potential would leave a critical gap in our national defense. Alaska retains a defense value that is both psychological and real. Alaska has been United States territory for 80 years. Americans anywhere would be as quick to resent an aggressive attack on Alaska as they were on Pearl Harbor, or as they would be on any part of the continental United States. Such an attack on Alaska would be certain cause for war.

The average concept of Alaska and the Arctic is continuous cold, icebergs, glaciers, Eskimos, and generally uncomfortable living conditions. The people of the United States should be informed of the fact that this is not an accurate picture. While it is true that winter months are in some areas severe and really Arctic, it is also true that occasionally temperatures and conditions exist which are experienced as far south as the middle United States.

Students of geopolitics have long been familiar with the teachings of Sir Halford Mackinder, who reasoned that whichever nation dominates a certain land mass (which he called the heartland) lying partly in Europe and partly in Asia, would be able eventually to control the whole world. More recent geopolitical theory speaks of two heartlands—the one designated by Mackinder, and another in North America. The shortest distance between the two "heartlands" of the world is across the Arctic regions. Our Arctic frontier has become, therefore, our primary defense consideration. Alaska, the northernmost portion of our Nation, thus assumes a place of primary importance in the strategy of national security.

Referring to some needs of the moment, General Twining wrote:

Logistical requirements in Alaska are many. Pipe lines are greatly needed. The existing railroad must be improved. New railways and highways are needed. Alaska has less than 3,000 miles of highways and roads in an area twice the size of Texas. These 3,000 miles would be called secondary roads in the continental United States. They could not sustain any major operation.

ALASKA UNPREPARED

My good friend Paul Herring, of Kodiak, Alaska, in a talk made before the Rotary Club of that community not long ago dealt in facts when he said:

With all the rough talk that we are making in the diplomatic world today are we prepared to back it up if war should be forced on us tomorrow? Of course, we are not in a position to answer this question for the rest of the world but our first and immediate concern is for Alaska, and our answer to the above question is a positive and emphatic "No; we are not prepared!" It is a fact that it would take no more than two or three thousand paratroopers properly equipped to descend upon and capture or destroy every military or naval establishment in Alaska today. This could be accomplished in 24 hours or less.

Paul Herring's statement was made before combat troops were sent to Alaska for training. Despite their presence, scattered as they are and numerically weak, it follows that no major thrust would be required by an enemy to take over Alaska.

William L. Baker, editor and publisher of the Ketchikan, Alaska, Chronicle, recently wrote five enlightening articles concerning the lack of preparation in Alaska in a military way:

Geography has placed Alaska in a position—

Wrote Mr. Baker—

to make it a probable battleground in any war between the two great remaining powers of the world.

There are no Maginot lines; no allies to hold the foe while we prepare.

A high officer in the Army Air Forces admitted to me recently that the construction program won't be completed at the present rate of progress for 8 to 10 years, and at that time it will be worthless. "How," he asked, "can we start building underground facilities when we don't get enough money to maintain a handful of air bases and to build houses for our personnel?"

The Bering Sea today is the hemisphere's frontier, and it boasts not a single first-class airfield along its thousand miles of coast line.

WE MUST ACT NOW

Maj. Gen. J. H. Atkinson, commander of the Air Forces in Alaska, in an address made before the Veterans of Foreign Wars encampment at Seward last month was quoted as having said:

The Army is not in Alaska to fan the flames of war, but Alaska is the strategic outpost, and the Army must guard against the area taking on a false sense of security.

Aside from the immediate strengthening of military forces General Atkinson called for improved railroads and highways, proper housing, adequate port, dock, and warehouse installations and modern airports.

All of us can hope and pray that existing tensions will be wiped away and that this troubled world may have a long period of peace. But since none of us can peer into the future clearly we cannot leave everything to hope. We must make prudent preparations for that which might occur. The desire of the American people for peace will never, we hope, again be accompanied by a lack of preparation for defense against an aggressive power. Since we must prepare and since man's inventive genius has narrowed time and space, we must make it sure and positive that our own land cannot be seized from us to provide the base for an attack on these States.

I recall that my distinguished predecessor as Delegate to Congress, Judge Anthony J. Dimond, called on the Nation in the early 1930's to fortify Alaska from the aggression he feared even then from the Japanese. He urged that a hundred million dollars be spent on naval fortifications in the Territory. His pleas went unheard. Not one penny was appropriated. Had that work been done then, it is highly unlikely the Japanese could ever have seized the outer Aleutians. They were dislodged at tremendous cost in money and American lives. Before the war, Delegate Dimond urged, too, that the Army garrison in Alaska, numbering then less than 300 officers and men, be expanded. But nothing was done. So when war did come, defenses which should have been built long before had to be constructed speedily at much greater cost and with much less efficiency than would have been the case otherwise. Had the Japanese desired to, they could have captured Alaska just as easily as it can be taken now.

We cannot afford to make the same mistake twice. We must realize and we must never forget that Alaska is the first and most important line in this Nation's defense. With it, bases would be ours to insure victory. Without it, we could be defeated. We must act and act now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] may extend his remarks in the RECORD regardless of the limit of cost reviewing the work of the Committee on Ways and Means, which he feels will be useful to each Member of the House. The cost will be about $450.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in regard to the work of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that each member of the Committee on Ways and Means may extend his remarks with reference to the work of Mr. KNUTSON as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the several requests are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Housing, a Party Test."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, one concerning rural electrification and the other to include a letter concerning national park concessions.

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

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

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

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the need for a strong merchant marine.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a timely editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therewith certain editorial and newspaper articles.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Samuel B. Pettengill.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MATHEWS. 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 New Jersey

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I suggest this motto for self-styled liberals and progressives, "Never do yourself anything you can get the Government to do for you."

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY FUNCTIONS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6771),

making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGEL of Michigan, CASE of South Dakota, TIBBOTT, SCRIVNER, KERR, MAHON, and NORRELL.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes, which was requested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The Clerk will read.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the reading of the engrossed copy.

The bill was read the third time by title.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PHILBIN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PHILBIN moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 6401) to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. 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.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

The roll call is automatic.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members; and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 125, nays 283, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—125

Allen, Ill.	Bloom	Clevenger
Andersen, H. Carl	Bolton	Clippinger
Andresen, August H.	Bradley	Cole, Mo.
Arnold	Brehm	Crosser
Banta	Buffett	Crow
Barden	Busbey	Cunningham
Beall	Butler	Davis, Wis.
Bender	Carson	Dawson, Utah
Bishop	Celler	Delaney
Blatnik	Chenoweth	Dolliver
	Chiperfield	Donohue
	Church	Doughton
	Douglas	Klein
	Elliott	Knutson
	Ellis	Landis
	Elsaesser	Lemke
	Feighan	Lewis, Ohio
	Folger	Love
	Gallagher	McCowen
	Gillie	McCulloch
	Granger	McGarvey
	Grant, Ind.	McGregor
	Griffiths	Madden
	Gross	Maloney
	Gwynne, Iowa	Mansfield
	Hagen	Marcantonio
	Harness, Ind.	Martin, Iowa
	Havenner	Mason
	Heffernan	Miller, Conn.
	Hill	Miller, Nebr.
	Hoeven	Mitchell
	Hoffman	Morris
	Holifield	Murray, Wis.
	Horan	Nicholson
	Hull	Nodar
	Isaacson	O'Hara
	Jenison	O'Konski
	Jenkins, Ohio	Pfeifer
	Johnson, Ill.	Philbin
	Johnson, Ind.	Powell
	Jones, Wash.	Rankin
	Keefe	Reed, Ill.
	Keogh	Reed, N. Y.
		Rees
		Rich
		Rockwell
		Rooney
		Sabath
		Sadowski
		Schwabe, Mo.
		Schwabe, Okla.
		Scoblick
		Scott, Hardie
		Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
		Shafer
		Short
		Simpson, Ill.
		Smith, Kans.
		Smith, Ohio
		Smith, Wis.
		Snyder
		Somers
		Stanley
		Stefan
		Stevenson
		Stratton
		Twyman
		Vail
		Vursell
		Weichel
		Welch
		Youngblood

NAYS—283

Abbitt	Dirksen	Jones, Ala.
Abernethy	Domengeaux	Jones, N. C.
Albert	Dondero	Jonkman
Allen, Calif.	Dorn	Judd
Allen, La.	Durham	Karsten, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Eaton	Kean
Andrews, Ala.	Eberharter	Kearney
Andrews, N. Y.	Ellsworth	Kearns
Angell	Elston	Keating
Arends	Engel, Mich.	Kee
Auchincloss	Engle, Calif.	Kefauver
Bakewell	Evins	Kelley
Barrett	Fallon	Kennedy
Bates, Ky.	Fellows	Kersten, Wis.
Bates, Mass.	Fenton	Kilburn
Battle	Fernandez	Kilday
Beckworth	Fisher	King
Bell	Flanagan	Kirwan
Bennett, Mich.	Fletcher	Kunkel
Bennett, Mo.	Fogarty	Lanham
Blackney	Foote	Larcade
Bland	Forand	Latham
Boggs, Del.	Fuller	Lea
Boggs, La.	Fulton	LeCompte
Bonner	Gamble	LeFevre
Boykin	Garmatz	Lesinski
Bramblett	Gary	Lewis, Ky.
Brooks	Gathings	Lichtenwalter
Brophy	Gavin	Lodge
Brown, Ga.	Gearhart	Lucas
Bryson	Gillette	Lusk
Buchanan	Goff	Lyle
Buck	Goodwin	Lynch
Buckley	Gordon	McConnell
Bulwinkle	Gore	McCormack
Burke	Gorski	McDonough
Burleson	Gossett	McDowell
Byrne, N. Y.	Graham	McMahon
Byrnes, Wis.	Grant, Ala.	McMillan, S. C.
Camp	Gregory	McMillen, Ill.
Canfield	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mack
Cannon	Hale	MacKinnon
Carroll	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mahon
Case, N. J.	Hall, Leonard W.	Manasco
Case, S. Dak.	Halleck	Mathews
Chadwick	Hand	Meade, Md.
Chapman	Hardy	Merrow
Chelf	Harless, Ariz.	Michener
Clark	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Clason	Harrison	Miller, Md.
Coffin	Hart	Mills
Cole, Kans.	Harvey	Monroney
Cole, N. Y.	Hays	Morgan
Colmer	Hébert	Morrison
Combs	Hedrick	Morton
Cooley	Herter	Muhlenberg
Cooper	Heselton	Multer
Corbett	Hess	Mundt
Cotton	Hinshaw	Murdock
Coudert	Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.
Courtney	Holmes	Nixon
Cox	Hope	Norblad
Crawford	Huber	Norrell
Curtis	Jackson, Calif.	Norton
Dague	Jackson, Wash.	O'Brien
Davis, Ga.	Jarman	Pace
Davis, Tenn.	Javits	Passman
Dawson, Ill.	Jenkins, Pa.	Patman
Deane	Jennings	Patterson
Devitt	Johnson, Calif.	Peterson
D'Ewart		Phillips, Calif.
Dingell		Phillips, Tenn.
		Pickett
		Ploeser
		Plumley
		Poage
		Potter
		Potts
		Poulson
		Preston
		Price, Fla.
		Price, Ill.
		Priest
		Rains
		Ramey
		Rayburn
		Redden
		Reeves
		Richards
		Riehlman
		Riley
		Rivers
		Rizley
		Rogers, Fla.
		Rogers, Mass.
		Rohrbough
		Ross
		Russell
		Sadlak
		St. George
		Sanborn
		Sarbacher
		Sasscer
		Scrivner
		Seely-Brown
		Sheppard
		Sikes
		Simpson, Pa.
		Smathers
		Smith, Maine
		Smith, Va.
		Spence
		Stockman
		Sundstrom
		Taber
		Talle
		Taylor
		Teague
		Thomas, Tex.
		Thompson
		Tibbott
		Tollefson
		Towe
		Trimble
		Van Zandt
		Vinson
		Vorys
		Wadsworth
		Walter
		Wheeler
		Whitten
		Whittington
		Wigglesworth
		Williams
		Wilson, Tex.
		Winstead
		Wolcott
		Wolverton
		Woodruff
		Worley

NOT VOTING—22

Brown, Ohio	Lane	Stigler
Cravens	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	Macy	West
Hendricks	Meade, Ky.	Whitaker
Jensen	O'Toole	Wilson, Ind.
Johnson, Okla.	Peden	Wood
Johnson, Tex.	Regan	
Kerr	Robertson	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice.

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. West.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Mead of Kentucky with Mr. Lane.

Mr. GILLIE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SHAFER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BEALL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HOEVEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MCGARVEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—years 282, nays 131, answered "present" 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—282

Abbitt	Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ga.
Abernethy	Battle	Bryson
Albert	Beall	Buchanan
Allen, Calif.	Beckworth	Buck
Allen, La.	Bell	Buckley
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Bulwinkle
Andrews, Ala.	Blackney	Burke
Andrews, N. Y.	Bland	Burleson
Angell	Boggs, Del.	Byrne, N. Y.
Arends	Boggs, La.	Byrnes, Wis.
Auchincloss	Bonner	Camp
Bakewell	Boykin	Canfield
Barrett	Bramblett	Carroll
Bates, Ky.	Brooks	Case, N. J.

Chadwick	Harvey	Nodar
Chapman	Hays	Norblad
Chelf	Hébert	Norrell
Clark	Hedrick	Norton
Clason	Hendricks	O'Brien
Cole, Kans.	Herter	Pace
Cole, N. Y.	Heselton	Passman
Colmer	Hess	Patman
Combs	Hinshaw	Patterson
Cooley	Hobbs	Peterson
Cooper	Holmes	Phillips, Calif.
Corbett	Hope	Pickett
Cotton	Huber	Ploeser
Coudert	Jackson, Calif.	Plumley
Courtney	Jackson, Wash.	Poage
Cox	Jarman	Potter
Cravens	Jenkins, Pa.	Potts
Crawford	Jennings	Poulson
Crow	Johnson, Calif.	Preston
Cunningham	Jones, Ala.	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Jones, N. C.	Price, Ill.
Dague	Jonkman	Priest
Davis, Ga.	Judd	Rains
Davis, Tenn.	Karsten, Mo.	Ramey
Dawson, Ill.	Kean	Rayburn
Deane	Kearney	Redden
Devitt	Kearns	Reeves
Dingell	Keating	Richards
Dirksen	Kee	Riehlman
Domengeaux	Kefauver	Riley
Dondero	Kelley	Rivers
Donohue	Kennedy	Rizley
Dorn	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Fla.
Durham	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Eaton	Kilday	Rohrbough
Eberharter	King	Ross
Elston	Kirwan	Russell
Engel, Mich.	Kunkel	Sadlak
Engle, Calif.	Lanham	St. George
Evins	Larcade	Sarbacher
Fallon	Latham	Sasscer
Fellows	Lea	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Fenton	LeCompte	Scrivner
Fernandez	LeFevre	Seely-Brown
Fisher	Lesinski	Sheppard
Flannagan	Lewis, Ky.	Sikes
Fletcher	Lichtenwalter	Simpson, Pa.
Fogarty	Lodge	Smathers
Foote	Lucas	Smith, Maine
Forand	Lusk	Smith, Va.
Fuller	Lyle	Spence
Fulton	Lynch	Stanley
Gamble	McConnell	Stockman
Garmatz	McCormack	Sundstrom
Gary	McDonough	Taber
Gathings	McDowell	Talle
Gavin	McMahon	Taylor
Gearhart	McMillan, S. C.	Teague
Gillette	McMillen, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.
Goff	Mack	Thompson
Goodwin	MacKinnon	Tibbott
Gordon	Mahon	Tollefson
Gore	Manasco	Towe
Gorski	Mathews	Trimble
Gossett	Meade, Md.	Van Zandt
Graham	Merrow	Vinson
Grant, Ala.	Meyer	Vorys
Gregory	Michener	Wadsworth
Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Calif.	Walter
Hale	Miller, Md.	Wheeler
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mills	Whitten
Hall, Leonard W.	Monroney	Whittington
Halleck	Morgan	Wigglesworth
Hand	Morrison	Williams
Hardy	Morton	Wilson, Tex.
Harless, Ariz.	Muhlenberg	Winstead
Harris	Multer	Wolcott
Harrison	Mundt	Wolverton
Hart	Murdock	Woodruff
	Murray, Tenn.	Worley
	Nixon	

NAYS—131

Allen, Ill.	Case, S. Dak.	Folger
Andersen, H. Carl	Celler	Gallagher
	Chenoweth	Gillie
Andresen, August H.	Chiperfield	Granger
	Church	Grant, Ind.
Arnold	Clevenger	Griffiths
Banta	Clippinger	Gross
Barden	Coffin	Gwynne, Iowa
Bender	Cole, Mo.	Hagen
Bennett, Mo	Crosser	Harness, Ind.
Bishop	Davis, Wis.	Havenner
Blatnik	Dawson, Utah	Heffernan
Bloom	Delaney	Hill
Bolton	D'Ewart	Hoeven
Bradley	Dolliver	Hoffman
Brehm	Doughton	Holifield
Brophy	Douglas	Horan
Buffett	Elliott	Hull
Busbey	Ellis	Isacson
Butler	Ellsworth	Javits
Cannon	Elsaesser	Jenison
Carson	Feighan	Jenkins, Ohio
Jensen	Mason	Schwabe, Mo.
Johnson, Ill.	Miller, Conn.	Schwabe, Okla.
Johnson, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.	Scoblick
Jones, Wash.	Mitchell	Scott, Hardie
Keefe	Morris	Shafer
Keogh	Murray, Wis.	Short
Kerr	Nicholson	Simpson, Ill.
Klein	O'Hara	Smith, Kans.
Knutson	O'Konski	Smith, Ohio
Landis	Pfeifer	Smith, Wis.
Lemke	Philbin	Snyder
Lewis, Ohio	Phillips, Tenn.	Somers
Love	Powell	Stefan
McCowen	Rankin	Stevenson
McCulloch	Reed, Ill.	Stratton
McGarvey	Reed, N. Y.	Twyman
McGregor	Rees	Vail
Macy	Rich	Vursell
Madden	Rockwell	Weichel
Maloney	Rooney	Wood
Mansfield	Sabath	Youngblood
Marcantonio	Sadowski	
Martin, Iowa	Sanborn	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Welch

NOT VOTING—16

Brown, Ohio	Meade, Ky.	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	O'Toole	West
Johnson, Okla.	Peden	Whitaker
Johnson, Tex.	Regan	Wilson, Ind.
Lane	Robertson	
Ludlow	Stigler	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Ludlow against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Whitaker.

Mr. CELLER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DOMENGEAUX changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. POWELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 671, the Chair lays before the House the Senate bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substitute the House bill H. R. 6401, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of New York moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 2655 and insert the provisions of H. R. 6401, as amended.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill S. 2655, with a House amendment, insist on the amendment of the House, and ask for a conference with the Senate, and that the Speaker appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution, House Resolution 690, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insist upon its amendment to S. 2655, ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes, and that the Speaker immediately appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] desire to use any of his time?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If this resolution is agreed to, when the bill goes to conference will the conferees have a right to agree to the Senate bill, without coming back to the House for instructions?

The SPEAKER. The Chair, of course, cannot anticipate what action the conferees would take or what action the Senate might take.

Mr. RICH. Suppose the House conferees agree to everything that the Senate wants, without having the amendment containing the provisions of the House bill in the legislation, would they not be required to come back here?

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman understands that whatever the conferees do, they must report back to the House for further action. Their recommendations must be supported by the House later.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. The last I could hear about the motion was: "And with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole." I understand several amendments were adopted in the Committee of the Whole. I wish to know if the Shafer amendment will be a part of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The so-called Shafer amendment is a part of the House amendment to the Senate bill; that is right.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time allotted to me except to point out that the House has voted by substantial majorities certain amendments. I think the Managers on the part of the House at the conference should feel duty bound to insist on the amendments the House voted into this bill.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I merely wish to repeat what I said in general debate yesterday: I know I am going to be a lonely figure, I am going to be alone. My hands are tied, but I will fight over there. And then they will bring it back and throw it into your laps. I hope that you have enough conscience, and courage, and conviction to rise up and vote on that conference report when it is returned to you.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from New York wants to do so, he can offer a motion to instruct the conferees to stand by the House bill.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. As I remember it, an amendment was adopted by the committee in anticipation of the Shafer amendment. Will it likewise be in the bill?

The SPEAKER. All the amendments adopted in the House will go to the conference.

Mr. FOLGER. All right. They will have a scrap over there.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, is a motion to instruct conferees to stand by the House amendments in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that such a motion is not in order at this time.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I ask for this time only to say that whenever the gentleman from Mississippi comes to the rescue and aid of the gentleman from New York, Mr. Marcantonio, the days of miracles are not over.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, may I say that the gentleman from New York is in need neither of being rescued nor of a miracle.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to say that if the gentleman wishes to do so, as soon as the previous question is ordered it is in order to offer a motion to instruct conferees. That is the rule of the House that has always been followed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Mississippi that there is no previous question to be ordered, that the House is now considering under a suspension of the rules House Resolution 690, which carries the following provision:

That the House insist upon its amendments to the bill of the Senate, S. 2655, ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Speaker immediately appoint conferees.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. It has always been the rule and it is the rule now.

The SPEAKER. But this is under a suspension of the rules and it would not be in order after the adoption of the pending resolution to offer such a motion.

Mr. RANKIN. Then it is changing the rules of the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the resolution passed?

The question was taken and, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ANDREWS of New York, SHORT, COLE of New York, BATES of Massachusetts, VINSON, BROOKS, and KILDAY.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the House bill was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE DAY

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the gentleman from Indiana can tell us what the program is for the remainder of the day or at least some of it.

Mr. HALLECK. I can at least give enough to start us off, which will keep us busy for some time.

As I understand it, there are several conference reports ready for action and probably they should be disposed of first. Then it is proposed to call up some measures under suspensions and they will be called up approximately as follows:

First. A bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Second. The housing bill.

Third. Increase in postal pay and rates.

Fourth. Air parcel post.

Fifth. The so-called revolving fund matter which has to do with cotton and wool for export to Japan, which bill is from the Committee on the Armed Services.

There are five measures. Other measures may be called up under suspension during the day if we have time and if other matters do not intervene.

THE HONORABLE FRANCK R. HAVENNER, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to announce that a black blot upon the records of a former committee of the House of Representatives has been officially erased during the present session of Congress. On June 15 the Committee on Un-American Activities, by unanimous vote, ordered that testimony attacking the reputation of Representative FRANCK R. HAVENNER, of California, which was given at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the old Dies committee, held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, be expunged from the records of the committee.

Thus a regrettable chapter in the history of the so-called Dies committee has been obliterated by official action.

During the summer of 1940, while the Seventy-sixth Congress was in session and while Representative HAVENNER, a Member of that Congress, was at his post of duty here in the National Capital, he received information that an attempt would be made to give certain derogatory testimony concerning him before the Dies committee. Mr. HAVENNER informs me that he went to see the chairman of the committee, Representative Dies, of Texas, and inquired whether there was any truth in this report. Mr. Dies replied that he had heard nothing about it. Mr. HAVENNER then requested Chairman Dies to notify him if anyone attempted to give any testimony concerning him before the committee, in order that he might appear before the committee and exercise his right as a Member of Congress to testify in his own behalf. Dies assured him that this would be done.

After talking to the chairman, Mr. HAVENNER visited Representative Dempsey, of New Mexico, the ranking member of the Dies committee, and Representative Voorhis, of California, also a member of the committee, and made the same requests of them. Both also assured Representative HAVENNER that they would notify him immediately if they learned that any testimony concerning him was to be heard by the committee.

Now comes the most amazing feature of this regrettable episode in congressional history.

Not until more than 4 years had elapsed did Representative HAVENNER learn that, shortly after his conversation with Chairman Dies, a meeting of a subcommittee of the Dies committee, which was not public, was held in Beaumont, Tex. At that meeting, which was attended, as Mr. HAVENNER states, only by

one member of the committee, the secretary of the committee, Robert E. Stripling, and the then investigator for the committee, James H. Stedman, a witness named John L. Leech testified under oath that it was his understanding that Representative HAVENNER had been and was at that time a member of the Communist Party.

The first time that Congressman HAVENNER knew that this meeting had been held on July 16, 1940, and that damaging testimony concerning him had been taken under oath, was when political advertisements, containing excerpts from the testimony given by the witness Leech were printed in San Francisco newspapers in October 1944, during Mr. HAVENNER'S campaign for reelection to Congress.

Mr. HAVENNER never received any notification from Mr. Dies or from any other member or employee of the committee, or from anyone else, that this meeting was to be held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, and he was never given any opportunity to appear before the committee to refute this damaging testimony.

The record of the subcommittee hearing, which was not a public meeting, held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, was kept on the secret file of the committee for more than 4 years and was never officially released by the Dies committee for publication.

Just how the supporters of Mr. HAVENNER'S opponent in the 1944 campaign for Congress learned about the secret subcommittee meeting and obtained the record of its proceedings for publication has never been officially disclosed.

When Mr. HAVENNER was returned to Congress in January 1945, he took the floor of the House of Representatives and denounced the testimony of the witness Leech as perjury in its entirety. On that occasion every member of the old Dies committee who was present arose and stated that they had never heard of the secret subcommittee meeting held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, and had never known anything about the testimony concerning Mr. HAVENNER until he made his speech on the floor of the House.

When Mr. HAVENNER had concluded his statement, many Members of the House of Representatives voluntarily arose and expressed their confidence in Mr. HAVENNER'S patriotism and integrity.

Not a single Member of the House attempted to condone this testimony given in an attempt to smear their fellow Member, and many Members denounced it as an outrageous proceeding.

I participated in the discussion on the floor of the House on that occasion, and, in the course of my remarks, I said:

> There should be an investigation of the conspiracy to smear a gentleman who was a former Member of Congress and who is a Member of Congress today. The gentleman from California is the one who happened to be in that position today, but it might have been any other Member of this House.
>
> If that testimony was false it means that there was a conspiracy among certain individuals in California to smear the gentleman for a particular purpose. It seems to me to be a matter of interest to each and every Member of the House and I think, speaking as an individual, if anything is done that the committee should go further and if they do find falsehoods, look into them. They will find falsehoods, for the gentleman has denied that the statements were true. They should investigate the conspiracy because it concerns every Member of this body.
>
> As far as the gentleman himself is concerned, I have served with him, and I believe I speak the sentiments of every Member of this body. The gentleman may differ with me on this or that question, or differ with some of us who serve with him, but because we differ on public questions does not mean that we are not good Americans; it means simply a difference in our individual conscience and our individual judgment as to the best interests of the country. We may disagree as to judgment, but every man here has a love of America and is actuated by the same high patriotic motives as the gentlemen from California, who enjoys the confidence of every Member on each side of the aisle, as far as I know, who serves with him. I rise particularly to make this contribution because the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] enjoys our respect and confidence and because we recognize that he is both honorable and trustworthy.

The conviction which I expressed in these remarks back in 1945 that this whole unsavory affair indicated that there had been a conspiracy to misuse the privileged authority of a congressional committee in order to defame a Member of Congress is strengthened by certain information which Representative HAVENNER has recently given me. He states that with the permission of Chairman THOMAS he talked with the clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Stripling, who was present at the secret subcommittee meeting of the Dies committee down in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940.

Mr. HAVENNER asked the clerk of the committee who had arranged to bring the witness, Leech, whose home was in Los Angeles, out to this secret meeting in Beaumont, Tex., to give perjured testimony against a Member of Congress. The clerk, Mr. Stripling, replied that it was the duty of the investigator, James H. Stedman, to produce witnesses for the committee hearings. When Mr. HAVENNER asked to see Stedman, he was informed that the former investigator had not been employed by the committee for several years. Congressman HAVENNER inquired where Stedman was located, and was informed that after he left the committee he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., in Los Angeles, and was still in the employ of that company.

The President of the Honolulu Oil Co. is Mr. Albert C. Mattei, a gentleman who has been very active in Republican politics in northern California for many years. Congressman HAVENNER states that Mr. Mattei has been the chief financial and political supporter of every Republican candidate for Congress who has run against HAVENNER since our colleague was first elected to this House back in 1936. Mr. Mattei was the chief financial and political backer of Mr. HAVENNER'S Republican opponent for Congress in 1940, when the secret subcommittee meeting of the Dies committee was held down in Beaumont, Tex. Mr. Mattei was again the chief financial and political backer of Mr. HAVENNER'S opponent for Congress in 1944, when the defamatory perjured testimony taken at the secret subcommittee down in Beaumont, Tex., first saw the light of day in a political advertisement designed to defeat Mr. HAVENNER as a candidate for Congress.

And now it develops that when former Investigator Stedman, who is reported by the clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities to have produced the witness who gave the defamatory perjured testimony against Congressman HAVENNER at the secret subcommittee meeting down in Beaumont, Tex., severed his connection with that committee, he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., of which Mr. Mattei is the president.

I leave this astounding sequence of facts to the judgment of Congress and the American people.

Congressman HAVENNER is one of the ablest Members of the Congress, sincere, courageous, a fighter for the people, and loyal to the best interests of the people, he is a credit to the people of his district. Congressman HAVENNER is a great American.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1948

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, JOHNSON of Illinois, MURRAY of Wisconsin, FLANNAGAN, COOLEY, and PACE.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include recommendations.

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

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Felix Morley appearing in Human Events. This article proves again how far we have gone toward the totalitarian concept of government in our State Department.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. RUSSELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Missouri Bismarck Gazette.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an address by Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the Bridgeport Brass Co.

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

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

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

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter. In one of these instances it may exceed the limit under the rules, and due to the press of business in the Government Printing Office they have been unable to furnish me an estimate. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding the cost.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two resolutions adopted by Henry H. Houston II Post, No. 3.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

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

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas (at the request of Mr. PLUMLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

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

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this morning I voted for the bill to provide for a temporary draft but I did so with considerable skepticism and reluctance. The wisdom of peacetime conscription in a free country is always open to serious challenge. It is a dangerous power to extend in time of peace except upon the most stringent and limited terms. In my judgment, its necessity can only be justified on the need for sufficient military manpower to adequately defend our country against attack from any potential aggressor. I base my support of this measure on the fact that the President, as Commander in Chief, and our military experts have advised us that our manpower in the armed forces is inadequate for this purpose and that it cannot be obtained by voluntary procedures.

The evidence is abundant that our Military Establishment has not given the voluntary system of induction a fair trial. But it is not difficult to understand that a voluntary system can never be successful when the men in charge of such a program condemn it in advance and doom it to failure. As long as military men have that attitude, there is little or no chance for a voluntary program to succeed.

It should be definitely understood that this legislation is temporary and limited in duration to the period needed to fill our basic minimum manpower requirements. Such a system has no place in a free government in peacetime except upon that limited basis. So I have supported this legislation, Mr. Speaker, because it is temporary in nature and because I think that we must be adequately prepared to defend ourselves against outside aggression and thus be able to insure the preservation of our country and the safety of our people. But I definitely want to be on record as opposing the use of peacetime conscription as a means of implementing our foreign policy. If I thought we were putting additional men in uniform for the purpose of sending them to the far-flung corners of the earth, to settle other peoples' problems or fight other nations' wars, then I would be irrevocably opposed to it. The average American has no objection to being called at any time to assist in the defense of his country. The real fear of our potential soldiers is the constant uncertainty of whether their services will be used in the defense of this country or whether they will be sent to some distant land to become involved in the settlement of disputes which have nothing to do with our national security or defense. No one can blame an American soldier for wanting some assurance that he will not again be sent to foreign battlefields. If Congress does not give him that assurance, to whom can he look for it? Those who have conducted our foreign policy since the beginning of the last war have made one tragic blunder after another. This policy has been costly in dollars. Let us pray that it will never again be costly in American lives.

Mr. Speaker, this country cannot afford another global war. The last one cost over $360,000,000,000 and left us with a national debt of over two hundred and fifty billion. Another such war would not only impoverish and bankrupt this Nation, it would completely destroy our freedom and the system of government which protects it. It would annihilate the only republic on the face of the earth where human rights and dignity come ahead of the state. We can never again afford to risk this priceless heritage by engaging in another global war.

No single nation can shoulder the social, economic, and military problems of the rest of the world and expect to survive. The United States cannot do it and survive. Yet, step by step we are trying to assume that responsibility. Day by day in ever increasing numbers other nations are saddling us with their social, economic, and military burdens. If we do not soon discontinue this kind of program we will eventually find ourselves in the same desperate situation as those we are seeking to save.

Our foreign policy and our military power should be dedicated wholly and solely to the preservation of our own national security and welfare. If we use the military and economic prestige of the United States for these purposes we will be in a better position to help maintain world peace, without endangering the solvency or stability of our own Government—and without engaging in other people's wars.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include letters.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, in time of great national peril we must depend chiefly on able and loyal military and naval leaders for our security. It is more important today than ever before that the United States be assured that its future requirements for well-qualified and highly trained officers shall be adequately met.

Not long ago my attention was called to an editorial entitled "A Challenge to Service Schools," which summarized the criticisms directed at the United States Military and Naval Academies because of their short enrollments and unfilled vacancies. Under existing procedure, in a large measure the fact that there are unfilled vacancies in classes at the Academies may very well be the responsibility of Congress itself.

I sent the editorial in question to the Secretary of the Army with a request for his comments. His letter constituted so excellent a statement of the position of the Department and the Academy authorities that under the leave which has been granted I include its text together with a further exchange of letters between us. They are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., November 10, 1947.

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. REEVES: In further reply to your letter of October 6, 1947, I would like to outline the principal reasons, as they appear to

the Department of the Army, for the present understrength at West Point.

Your letter refers to the article in the Atlantic Monthly, written by Ralph Lee Smith, a former midshipman at the Naval Academy. I know that you did not expect me to comment directly on this article, but I do wish to comment briefly on references to it in the editorial in the Kansas City Star, since it might be inferred that the complaints of this former midshipman about instruction and traditions might apply to the military academy.

The Army has maintained vigilant interest in the instruction at West Point, and has not relied solely on its own judgment thereof. In 1945 the Secretary of War appointed a board to criticize the proposed curriculum and the transition from the 3-year to a 4-year course. The board was composed of Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. James P. Baxter III, president of Williams College, and several distinguished general officers of the Army, including Lt. Gen. Troy H. Middleton, comptroller of Louisiana State University. In their report, the consultants commented most favorably upon the methods of instruction, the progressiveness of the teaching staff, and the modern equipment in the academic department. The program of physical education and intramural athletics drew their praise. The general conclusion was that the academic program at the academy was thoroughly sound and provided the balanced and liberal education in the arts and sciences directed in the Department of the Army's statement of the academy's mission. The curriculum has been broadened to cover recent developments in nuclear physics and electronics, and the course in leadership increased to 4 years. Additional professors have been authorized by Congress, and appointed. The ratio of instructors to students has been maintained at a level permitting individual instruction. Daily recitations by each cadet reveal either proficiency or deficiency in each phase of instruction, thus eliminating mediocre efforts in midterm and cramming for final examinations. Weekly standings posted on bulletin board and monthly reports to parents keep both informed of the cadet's progress.

Tradition has ever been part of military service, and properly so. That it is an important factor in the life of the West Point cadet is undeniable. The honor code, developed and adhered to by generations of cadets, is the outstanding tradition at the Military Academy, and, with others, has served to inculcate in these young men the acceptance of "duty, honor, country" as a personal code. This spiritual indoctrination is no less important than the technical, cultural, and physical development of cadets. Civilian schools have their traditions and customs; and if those at the Military Academy demand more of the student in fortitude, self-control, and determination, it only reflects the striving for an ideal of character, courage, self-denial, forthrightness, and physical stamina that is expected of the Regular Army officer. These traditions place all cadets on a common footing, regardless of personal fortune or social background. They serve to identify weaklings and reveal to themselves and to the authorities those who are unable to conform to group living under strenuous circumstances, or who are temperamentally incapable of submission to authority.

The reasons, in the opinion of the Department of the Army, for the decrease in the number of applicants for admission to the Military Academy and the consequent understrength in the Corps of Cadets, are set forth below under six main headings.

1. American economic conditions: Inflated earnings increase the attraction of civilian pursuits, while rising living costs decrease interest in an education that involves an obligation to serve many years at relatively low fixed incomes. Because of high earnings throughout the war years, many parents who would otherwise be eager to obtain West Point appointments for their sons, with education at Government expense, have accumulated sufficient money to pay for a civilian education.

2. The apathy of the public toward military service: The apathy of the public toward military service that became apparent as soon as actual combat was over has adversely affected the number of applicants for West Point, just as it has affected the success of the recruiting program. It is reflected in a slight increase in resignations from the Military Academy as well as in a decrease in the number of applications for admission. I understand the understrength at the Military Academy has a parallel at the Naval Academy, and that the reasons therefor are believed to be similar to those affecting the Military Academy. History has repeated itself, inasmuch as the Military Academy and Naval Academy had similar experiences following World War I. A large proportion of the young men within the age limits for admission to West Point have already had Army service, and their attitude toward a military career has been shaped by their war experiences.

3. GI bill of rights: Many men within the age limits for admission to the Military Academy are entitled, by reason of military service, to the education benefits of the GI bill of rights. They have unlimited choice of subjects and wide selectivity of schools, without obligation for military service after graduation. This applies particularly to students who had completed one or more years at a civilian college or university prior to entering military service and for which they would not receive credit upon admission to the Military Academy. The advancement of science makes specialized study more essential to the successful engineer, nuclear physicist, doctor, and other professional men, and in the public mind renders a military education less attractive than formerly. While the curriculum at West Point has been broadened to include new developments in science, this fact is not completely known to the general public. Students with serious scientific ambitions do not see sufficient opportunity for West Point graduates to pursue specialized scientific studies at advanced technological schools.

4. Opportunities for obtaining Regular Army commission by other methods: Legislation recently passed by Congress increased the commissioned officer strength of the Regular Army to 50,000. It has been necessary, within a short period of time, to devise procurement methods to fill this increase. Many men who would be qualified and normally interested in attending the Military Academy have had an opportunity to obtain a Regular Army commission through these methods. While no figures are available as to the actual number of possible candidates for the Military Academy who were eliminated by the above cause, there is every reason to believe that the number was substantial. It is not unnatural that these men interested in a military career as commissioned officers should choose these other methods, which permit them to receive their Regular Army commission quickly and often in a higher rank than the second lieutenant's commission they would receive after four strenuous years at the Military Academy.

5. Increase in foreign service assignments: The duties imposed upon the Army by postwar conditions require much greater amounts of foreign service, often in very undesirable areas throughout the world. This is very distasteful to many men, in considering their future. Prior to the war, the years spent by an officer on foreign service covered a relatively short period of his career and usually were spent in areas which permitted him comfortable living and climatic conditions.

6. Hold-over of appointments of 1947 until 1948: Every year some Members of Congress notify The Adjutant General of their intention to carry their vacancies over to the following year, which is done either to reserve appointments for certain individuals or for lack of suitable applicants. There was a marked increase in hold-overs from 1947 to 1948, as compared with previous years, but no break-down as to the reasons therefor is available. The Congressmen do not always specify the reason, but where reasons are given, they generally indicate a decrease in applications or lowering of qualifications of applicants, thus reflecting the factors mentioned in previous paragraphs.

It is believed that the shortage that existed in the class entering the Military Academy in 1947 was brought more plainly to public attention because of the contrast of the present shortage to the abundance of applications for attendance at the Military Academy during the war years. During that period, there was never a dearth of candidates, available vacancies being applied for by many more times the number of men than could possibly be admitted. As a result, the Department of the Army was flooded with applications and the competition was keen. During the war years, the operation of the Selective Service System served to swell the number of applicants for the Military Academy. Under a ruling made by Selective Service in 1942, candidates holding appointments to the Military Academy were not liable for induction during the pendency of such appointments. New appointments for unsuccessful candidates could be obtained for each succeeding year that the applicant was within the age limit for admission. Many faced with the necessity of military service, sought appointments in a sincere desire to qualify for commissioned service. However, hundreds of others are believed to have taken advantage of this opportunity for deferment as a means of avoiding or postponing induction and possible exposure to hazardous duty. This painful fact was brought clearly to light when the suspension of the draft brought with it a complete reversal of the motivating interest in obtaining appointments. This was also reflected in the number of resignations from the Academy, and in declinations of appointments.

It is desired to present certain information relative to resignations at the Military Academy. In the years from 1921 to 1945, inclusive, resignations from the Military Academy were a minor factor in the number of vacancies, averaging only 29 a year. Immediately following both world wars, however, resignations jumped to a high figure, contributing in large measure to the total number of vacancies. Following are figures for the 2 years following each war:

1919: One hundred and forty resignations, or 10.5 percent of the authorized strength of 1,334.

1920: One hundred and two resignations, or 7.6 percent of the authorized strength of 1,334.

1946: One hundred and eighty-two resignations, or 7.3 percent of the authorized strength of 2,496.

1947: One hundred and fifty-two resignations, or 6.1 percent of the authorized strength of 2,496.

In 1921 and 1922 resignations dropped to a very low figure, possibly as a result of the depressed economy of that period. It is believed that resignations from the Academy in 1948 and 1949 will decline from the 1946–47 figures, but in view of existing economic and political conditions, an accurate forecast is impossible.

In reply to your quest'on about legislation authorizing the filling of vacancies, section 2 of the act of Congress approved June 3, 1942, authorizes the filling of vacancies occasioned by the nonuse of appointments, whether through failure to pass entrance

examination or otherwise. Section 2 provides:

"When on the date of admission of a new class the total number of cadets is below the number authorized, the Secretary of War may bring the corps of cadets to full strength by appointing qualified alternates and candidates recommended by the academic board, two-thirds thereof from qualified alternates and one-third thereof from qualified candidates (competitors): *Provided*, That any appointment made under this section shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law."

The only candidates who are eligible for consideration are those who have been found mentally and physically qualified in connection with an appointment held for admission on the first week day of July of the year concerned. No application is necessary for consideration by the academic board since all candidates who are fully qualified but who are not entitled to admission under the terms of their appointments are rated relatively according to general merit. The academic board, in determining the general merit, studies the records of these candidates and makes its selection based upon consideration of the academic grades and other pertinent factors which affect the qualifications of the various candidates to become officers of the Army. In spite of the provisions of section 2, it was impossible to fill all vacancies in 1947. It was found on July 1, 1947, after all other admissions were authorized, that the corps of cadets was operating at a strength of 2,227, or 269 less than its authorized strength. However, since there were only 14 qualified competitors left on the lists of competitive candidates, only that number of competitors and only 28 alternates (thereby maintaining the one-third, two-thirds ratio) could be admitted under the provisions of the law cited. Therefore, 227 vacancies remained unfilled (269 less 42). Action was recently taken by the Department of the Army to authorize the nomination of four candidates instead of three for each vacancy for enlisted men of the Regular Army and National Guard. Similar action had already been taken for all other sources of admission under which the number of nominations for each vacancy were limited. This will increase the number of qualified competitors, thus making the provisions of section 2 more effective in filling any vacancies which may exist in an entering class in the future.

Your interest in the United States Military Academy is greatly appreciated. If there is any further information you desire, I shall be happy to obtain it for you.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

NOVEMBER 22, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Under date of November 11 my secretary acknowledged receipt of your excellent letter of November 10, written in reply to my inquiry of October 6, 1947, concerning the reported understrength at the Military Academy at West Point.

You have answered my question completely. Much of the information and many of the comments which you included are particularly illuminating and would be of considerable interest to other Members of the House and to the public as well. For that reason I would like to include the text of your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I shall not do so unless it is agreeable to you. Do you have any objection to its publication?

* * * * *

During almost 4 years of service in the Army in World War II my observation and association with officers of the Regular Establishment gave me a high regard for the Academy and its traditions, and in my present position I feel keenly the responsibility to strengthen and encourage public interest and confidence in its work.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1947.

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. REEVES: Thank you for your letter of November 22, 1947, expressing your high regard for the United States Military Academy and its traditions, with which I most heartily agree.

I would be very glad to have the letter to which you refer published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I would also appreciate the publication of your letter of November 22, 1947.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have voted to recommit the draft bill to committee because this is the only means by which I can at this time express my disapproval of those amendments which have so weakened the effectiveness of the bill. I would prefer to give the committee another chance at a better bill. I recognize that this is not going to be done.

We are going to have to take the bill as it is. I will vote for it as the best we can get.

It is my judgment that the passage of an effective Selective Service Act is of more importance as a demonstration of the national determination to defend our way of life than any measure we have so far considered.

In the present state of the world we will be ill advised to adopt any measure which falls short of adequacy, and do anything which may be less than enough to accomplish our purpose, whether it be the enactment of measures of domestic import, of foreign aid, or of national defense.

Last night I looked across the Mall at the floodlights playing on the figure of Armed Freedom atop the Capitol Dome. The artist had given arms to Freedom, well knowing that unarmed she could not long be free. There seemed to be light enough on Armed Freedom but less was shed over either House. Perhaps there is a moral in this somewhere.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a short letter from the American Tariff League.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1948, I inserted in the RECORD an article from the May issue of ATL Topics, the magazine published by the American Tariff League. Portions of this article were read to the House to point out that the Gearhart antireciprocal trade extension bill passed by the House earlier in that week bore a striking resemblance to certain recommendations made by the Tariff League in the secret, star-chamber sessions of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tariff and Reciprocal Trade.

The article stated:

This temporary program parallels, in some instances the proposals for a long-range program, providing for flexible rate-setting by a new governmental commission, with opportunity for review by Congress, but not requiring congressional action, offered by ATL President H. Wickliffe Rose at the recent House Ways and Means Subcommittee hearings, and contained in the new ATL Declaration of Principles and Program for World Trade.

From this statement, as well as from comparing the unmistakable effect of the House bill in killing the Reciprocal Trade Act with the long-standing high-tariff hostility to the Reciprocal Trade program of the American Tariff League, it seemed a warrantable conclusion that the Tariff League should be claiming the credit which I inferred from the ATL article. Moreover, Mr. H. Wickliffe Rose, president of the American Tariff League, appeared to assume some responsibilities of authorship when he told the Senate Committee on Finance that "because H. R. 6556 incorporates some of the basic principles proposed in our declaration and because to that extent we believe it is in the right direction toward a sound, long-term program and policy, we approve the bill as a whole for an interim measure."

Mr. Chairman, I am in receipt of a letter dated June 11, 1948, from Mr. Richard H. Anthony, secretary of the American Tariff League, which states that the American Tariff League does not claim credit for H. R. 6556. In accordance with the request contained in the letter, under unanimous consent, I insert it at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

THE AMERICAN TARIFF LEAGUE,
New York 18, N. Y., June 11, 1948.

Congressman HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN EBERHARTER: Our attention has been called to a statement made by you on May 28 in the House of Representatives and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, beginning on page 6884. The title which, I assume, is intended to summarize the views of the speaker, is "American Tariff League Claims Credit for the Gearhart Bill."

This league does not claim credit for H. R. 6556, the bill in question, and we do not think that the article in our May issue of ATL's Topics, from which you quoted, can be properly construed in that way. You apparently have so construed it, however, and so we must categorically deny that your conclusion is the correct one.

The only part taken by the league in regard to pending legislation was the appearance of the president of the league, Mr. H. Wickliffe Rose, at hearings held by the House Ways and Means Subcommittee and the Senate Finance Committee. At both appearances he offered the league's "Declaration of Principles and Program for World Trade," which is briefly summarized in the

ATL Topics article you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Copies of that declaration were left by Mr. Rose at the time of his appearance before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee for every member of the full committee. You should have received one as a matter of course, and, to be sure that you have one, an additional copy is enclosed. I hope that you will want to give it careful study. It envisions a long-term program, and does not refer to any bill in either House of Congress.

You will remember that H. R. 6556 was not before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee at the time of the hearings the first week in May. Hence, Mr. Rose could not have addressed any remarks to that particular bill. However, when he appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on June 3, the hearings were on the subject of H. R. 6556, and in reference to that bill, Mr. Rose, as part of his testimony, made the statement which appears on pages 296–297 of the printed hearings entitled "Extending Authority to Negotiate Trade Agreements," as follows:

"The proposals in this declaration are directed to a long-term program and policy on tariff, in the belief that its adoption will foster world trade, peace, and prosperity. We do not expect you to analyze it in detail today, and we know that there is not time to prepare legislation for its complete adoption in this session of Congress.

"Consequently, we agree that it is practical to pass an interim extension of the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year, as in H. R. 6556, in order to give Congress the opportunity to study and develop a long-term program and policy.

"Furthermore, because H. R. 6556 incorporates some of the basic principles proposed in our declaration and because to that extent we believe it is in the right direction toward a sound, long-term program and policy, we approve the bill as a whole for an interim measure. Under this or any other act of Congress, however, we see nothing to be gained by the United States through additional international tariff bargaining agreements."

Mr. Rose's statement on H. R. 6556 is the full extent to which any league action has been taken thereon. We believe that an opportunity should be afforded the league to deny that it claims credit for H. R. 6556. In the interest of fair play, would you be willing to insert this letter in the RECORD?

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ANTHONY,
Secretary.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members of the House in emphasizing his position on this legislation, has quoted the words of George Washington when he said, "One of the most effectual means of preserving peace is to be prepared for war."

I believe in full and complete preparedness. It is absolutely necessary in view of the position that we find ourselves in today that we have adequate defenses. Not only with respect to manpower, but just as important we must have adequate air power, atomic power, together with the latest and most modern equipment that can be produced. We are living in a blundering, bleeding world and we are disappointed to find this country and the world at large so far from reaching an understanding of peace among the peoples of the various nations.

It is fundamental that our armed forces should be improved and modernized so that our country may at all times be adequately defended from any type of attack. As I understand it, the question involved today is whether peacetime conscription is required for an adequate and modernized system of national defense.

Those in charge of this legislation have given us to understand quite definitely that the need for additional men in the armed forces is not immediate. The House Committee on Armed Services in charge of the bill approved an amendment to this legislation to extend the enforcement of the draft for a period of at least 90 days following the effective date of the act, so that the bill as presently submitted and approved could not become effective until November of this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, according to the committee report and according to the facts submitted by the sponsors of this legislation, we have 1,211,818 men in our armed forces as of March 1, 1948. Four hundred and sixty-nine thousand four hundred and ninety-six are in the Army; 351,181 are in the Navy; 317,102 are in the Air Force; and 74,039 in the Marines. We now have the largest and strongest Navy in the world. In fact, our Navy is more than equal the strength of the combined navies of all the rest of the world. We are advised by those in charge of this legislation that the Navy has more enlistments than they need. In fact, our committee tells us that the Navy does not request or need peacetime conscription.

This Congress recently passed legislation to increase our Air Force to a 70-group corps. This is even larger than was requested by the Department of Defense. It is larger than was requested by the President. I was glad to support the authorization as well as the appropriation for the 70-group Air Force. In fact, I think the Air Force is the strong arm of our defense.

I want to pay tribute to the infantrymen who I think do not receive the credit to which they are entitled. It is not a glamorous job. We must not ignore the necessity of the men in the Infantry. It is a fact that the Infantry does not carry the appeal that we find in the Navy, the Marines, or the Air Force.

The first question involved I think is with respect to the immediate need of 300,000 additional men in order to bring the armed forces up to the strength that the Department of Defense has suggested. They tell us that the need is not immediate, but that in 3 or 4 months from now the authority of conscription may be required. I believe that only in case of a national emergency should we resort to a policy of registering two or three million men for conscription. Now, I call your attention to the fact that prior to World War II and during that period, a test of 59 points was the mimimum requirement. Since that time the requirement has been jumped to 80 points. I am told that if the requirement for induction were reduced to 70 points, and incidentally I have secured an amendment to the present bill to make such provision, there are a good many men who would join the armed forces if given an opportunity to do so. It has been pointed out the draftee, under this bill, will not have a choice of services. He will go where the Army assigns him.

Furthermore, the Army, instead of encouraging and building up the extension of the Reserve Corps for hundreds of thousands of men, have permitted it to dwindle and have disappointed and discouraged a good many men who would otherwise have joined the Reserve. It is unfortunate, too, that those in charge of the Regular Army of our country do not encourage the enlargement and the advancement of the National Guard, which after all was the backbone of the infantry organizations during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported every appropriation to increase our defenses all the way up and down the line and if this committee had made a real showing with respect to the need of the conscription of men for the armed forces, I should be glad to support this legislation. I regret that in view of the showing that has been made by those who propose this legislation, that I am unable to support it. And do not forget that if and when the need for conscription of men is shown, I will be one of the first to support it. Incidentally, I am inclined to agree with Members of this House who have spoken before me who believe that if the time comes for the need of the conscription of thousands and millions of men to defend our country against a foreign foe, we should at the same time conscript the wealth of our country as a part of that program. May it never be said again that our country produced millionaires who made profits from munitions of war, either directly or indirectly, while our young men were sacrificing their lives in the defense of their country.

Mr. DINGELL. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if what I hear regarding the so-called housing bill is true then I must vote against passage. I will not be guilty of the betrayal of the trusting millions among our people or perpetrating a hoax upon our deserving veterans who while promised solution of the housing shortage now face years of slum existence as a reward for their unfaltering patriotic service. I have been watching this bill and the arduous road over which it was compelled to travel. In the Committee on Banking and Currency the other day it seemed certain that the coalition of 11 Democratic and 3 Republican Members saved the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and restored the people's confidence in the integrity of the Congress. This morning however, I learn that the whipping received by the 3 Republican Members who joined in righteousness their Democratic colleagues has inclined them to

once again follow the wrong course toward ease and error. I shall not have the opportunity to discuss the iniquities of the Wolcott bill when presented to us later this afternoon. I shall not blame the Republican leadership for this because time grows short but I must place the blame upon the leadership of the party in control for encouraging—yes, for forcing the Republican members of the committee to reconsider their vote, reversing their position, and reporting the husk of what might have been a real housing bill. The Wolcott bill raises the cry of socializing housing, but nothing is said about the socializing support of Government given to builders in guaranteeing loans, in the taking over, specially, of Government-built housing at an accelerated depreciation in order to reduce taxes and thereby increase the financial return to the investor. I must oppose the bill if it does not contain the public-housing provision to which the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman WOLCOTT, is uncompromisingly opposed. To meet any standard slum clearance rural housing, too, must be included. All these features involve the family life of our country and upon this family life the Government is founded. Anything that imperils family life undermines and endangers our country.

The public-housing feature in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to which the real-estate lobby so strongly objected and which has been wiped out in the Wolcott proposal dooms to the slums the widow and the children who unfortunately having lost their husband and father cannot meet the rentals charged while the breadwinner lived. The subsidized rental property intended by the T-E-W bill was condemned and stricken from the Wolcott bill as socialistic. Seemingly there is no concern about the widow and orphaned children of a citizen, and he may have been a veteran, when they are forced to give up their old home for an alley slum all because of the death in the family. The Wolcott bill preserves the slum for the use of the unfortunate upon the pretense that it is socialistic to render aid to helpless future citizens. What little might be saved to the Treasury of the United States will be paid out a thousandfold due to delinquency in health and morals, which thrive in the slums and which will require the construction of asylums, hospitals, and prisons.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"; and

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the Act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAIN, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. FULBRIGHT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) entitled "An act for the relief of the Massman Construction Company."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 333. An act for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II;

H. R. 371. An act for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas;

H. R. 564. An act for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg;

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Anthony Arancio;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Adney W. Gray;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp. of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 1779. An act for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of George Cleve Williams;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2551. An act for the relief of William R. Ramsey;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Henry;

H. R. 2889. An act for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3261. An act for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson;

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of Petrol Corp.;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edmund Huppler;

H. R. 4199. An act for the relief of George Haniotis;

H. R. 4441. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency;

H. R. 4452. An act for the relief of Douglas L. Craig;

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 4518. An act for the relief of Gerald S. Furman;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey);

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen;

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 4690. An amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5886. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6096. An act 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;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6412. An act to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President";

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6454. An act 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, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6598. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended.

The message also 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. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations.

PRINTING OF THE DEMOCRATIC WAY AND THE TOTALITARIAN WAY AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 678) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the volume entitled "The Democratic Way and the Totalitarian Way" prepared under the joint auspices of the United States Commissioner of Education and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress be printed as a House document.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, after "printed", insert "with illustrations."

Line 5, after "document", insert a comma and the following: "and that three thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on House Administration."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF GEN. JOSE GERVASIO ARTIGAS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the bill (S. 2591) to provide for acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States the bronze statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, as a gift from the people of Uruguay, and erect the same on a suitable site to be selected by the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in a public park or other federally owned property in the District of Columbia. Such statue shall not be erected until the plans and specifications for the pedestal and landscaping have been submitted to and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. The preparation of the plans and specifications for the pedestal and landscaping and the erection of the statue shall be under the supervision of the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including the design and construction of a suitable pedestal for such statue, the landscaping of the adjacent area, and the necessary plans therefor.

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

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 686) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $15,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF STATISTICS OF HOUSING

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 684) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed additional copies of part numbered 2 of the final majority report of the Joint Committee on Housing entitled "Statistics of Housing," for the use of the said joint committee, the cost of which shall not exceed $500.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 672) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 403, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed $100,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 4, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$20,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ON THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES AS AN ADVOCATE OF OVERTHROW OF GOVERNMENT BY FORCE AND VIOLENCE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 199) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 11,000 additional copies of the report (H. Rept. No. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence, of which 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the House document room.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 2, strike out "eleven thousand" and insert "six thousand."

Line 6, strike out "ten thousand" and insert "five thousand."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVELYN RICHARDSON

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 677 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Evelyn Richardson, widow of J. Frederick Richardson, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said J. Frederick Richardson.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment on page 2 of the bill.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

LEONARD W. HALL,
ROBERT HALE,
WILLIAM J. MILLER,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
CLYDE M. REED,
E. H. MOORE,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
BRIEN MCMAHON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate made two amendments to the bill. One amendment inserted at the end of the bill a new section 3 amending section 303 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so that the penalty provided therein would apply only to violations which were willful or resulted from gross negligence. The other amendment modified the title of the bill because of the new provision added by the first amendment.

The committee of conference recommend that the Senate recede from both amendments.

LEONARD W. HALL,
ROBERT HALE,
WILLIAM J. MILLER,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a conference report on the so-called Miller bill?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. What was done in conference with the so-called Moore amendment?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. The Senate receded and concurred and the so-called Moore amendment was stricken out of the bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, S. 2341, to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory," approved May 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 491), is amended by striking out "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "not to exceed $150,000."

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

PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pnuematic-tube systems, and for other purposes, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. REES, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee.

AMENDING VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5508) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans, 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 1, line 9, strike out "legally."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2739) to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1949, a special 5-cent air mail postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.

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

TERMINATING RETIREMENT SYSTEM OF OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2692) to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, which was approved by the committee on June 17, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence after the first proviso of the second paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 12, sec. 481), is amended by deleting the comma after the words "whose compensation" and striking out the words "including retirement annuities to be fixed by the Comptroller of the Currency" and deleting the comma following those words.

SEC. 2. (a) The United States Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain the amount of the gross assets in the retirement fund of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Comptroller of the Currency is authorized and directed to cause to be transferred all such assets to the Secretary of the Treasury to be entered on the books of the Treasury Department to the credit of the civil service retirement and disability fund.

(b) In the case of each officer or employee who is a member of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the United States Civil Service Commission shall cause to be credited to his individual account in the civil service retirement and disability fund an amount equal to such employee's accumulated contributions and interest standing to his credit on the books of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at the time of

its termination: *Provided*, That in the event that such amount is in excess of the amount which would have been to his credit had he made the contributions required for allowable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 22, 1920, as amended, currently during the same period of time for which he has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, plus interest thereon, such excess amount shall be applied to any other deposits or redeposits required of such employee under sections 7, 9, and 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, covering periods of allowable service for which said employee did not have creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, or, if he has no such additional allowable service, the excess shall be repaid to such employee in cash: *Provided further*, That no part of said sum credited to such employee's individual account shall be applied to any period of allowable service prior to August 1, 1920, or to periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, for which periods no deposit shall be required, as provided by section 9 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; nor shall deposits be required for any periods of time prior to June 1, 1936, for which such employee has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, in excess of the amount of such employee's accumulated contributions plus interest standing to his credit on the books of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at the date of its termination.

SEC. 3. (a) In the case of an officer or employee who, prior to the effective date of this act, shall have been retired on annuity under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office, the annuity shall be paid out of the civil service retirement and disability fund and shall be increased effective on the first day of the third month following the month in which this act is enacted by 25 percent or $300, whichever is the lesser: *Provided*, That each such annuitant may, prior to the effective date herein prescribed, elect to retain his or her present annuity in lieu of the increased annuity provided by this subsection and name his wife or her husband to receive upon his or her death one-half of his or her present annuity but not to exceed $600 per annum during the remainder of the life of such surviving wife or husband and upon the death of such survivor no further annuity shall be due or payable: *Provided further*, That the amount payable in the event of the death of the annuitant either to his nominated beneficiary or estate, in the form of a lump-sum payment or survivor's annuity, shall not be less than the amounts which would have been payable under the applicable rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office.

(b) In the case of any officer or employee who was a member of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office and who, prior to the effective date of this act, terminated his employment with that office and elected to receive a deferred annuity at age 65, under the applicable rules and regulations of the retirement system of that office, such annuity shall be payable out of the civil service retirement and disability fund beginning at the age of 62 years. Otherwise his rights shall be determined and the annuity computed as though this act had not been enacted.

SEC. 4. In the case of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency who withdrew his accumulated contributions from the retirement fund of that office upon leaving its employ, said officer or employee or former officer or employee of such office shall be entitled to the same allowable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to which he would have been entitled if he had never been a member of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office, subject, however, to the payment of the deposits required under said act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

SEC. 5. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins at least 30 days after the date of its enactment.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 6771

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 6771.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 30, 34, 35, 42, 46, 54, 61, 62, 70, 78, 79, 80, 93, 96, 118, 135, 144, 147, 170, 172, 173, 185, 186, 202, 226, and 243.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 39, 44, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 67, 68, 69, 71, 87, 88, 89, 94, 95, 99, 104, 108, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 145, 148, 153, 158, 160, 162, 165, 167, 168, 169, 171, 174, 175, 176, 179, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 204, 205, 207, 208, 210, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 228, 229, and 230, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$1,115,842"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "not to exceed $50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$160,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "purchase of one passenger motor vehicle;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$215,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

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

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,888,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *"Provided further*, That not exceeding eight per centum of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That interest heretofore collected by Bonneville Power Administration from sales of electric energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam on the unamortized balance of investment allocated to power in Grand Coulee Dam shall be covered into the reclamation fund forthwith: *Provided further*, That, awaiting legislation, said interest shall not be allocated during the fiscal year 1949"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said

amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That none of the appropriations made in this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel assigned to regional offices of the Bureau of Land Management in excess of the average total number of all personnel assigned to such regional offices during the fiscal year 1948"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Salaries and expenses, district offices: For expenses of district offices at Billings, Montana, and Portland, Oregon, only, including printing and binding, $200,000: *Provided*, That any unobligated balances of 1948 appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for payment to employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from service or furlough from active duty by reason of reduction in force under the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses, District Offices'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,334,115"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,242,015"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$755,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate nmbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,411,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$3,154,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$188,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$36,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$167,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "two hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "purchase of not to exceed one hundred and twenty-five for replacement only in fiscal year 1949, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "hire,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", at rates for individuals not in excess of $100 per diem (not exceeding $100,000)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That not exceeding $48,000,000 of appropriations available for expenditure by the Bureau of Reclamation during the fiscal year 1949 shall be used for administrative personal service and other personal services"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the total number of employees in the Bureau of Reclamation holding a permanent, temporary, or other appointment in grades CAF-9 and P-3, or above, shall not exceed three thousand five hundred at any one time during the fiscal year 1949"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ", and in addition thereto the Commissioner of Reclamation is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$147,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,293,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$57,985"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,298,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,780,175"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,200,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$230,437"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$814,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$220,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$447,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$169,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$101,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$292,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$217,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,645,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$337,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$206,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$93,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$57,212"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 123: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$77,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$104,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,470,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$212,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 130: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Central Valley project, California: Joint facilities, $1,750,000; irrigation facilities, $30,876,900; irrigation distribution systems, $1,000,000; power facilities, surveys, $20,000, Shasta power plant, $1,000,000, Keswick Dam, $1,700,000, Keswick power plant, $1,000,000; switch yards, Shasta, Keswick and Tracy pulping plant, $3,250,000; transmission lines, Shasta to Delta (Tracy) via Oroville and Sacramento, $500,000, Shasta Dam to Shasta substation, $250,000; substation, Contra Costa, $12,000; in all, $41,358,900, no part of which shall be available for examination and surveys in connection with power facilities in any State other than the State of California: *Provided*, That the unobligated balance on June 30, 1948, of funds heretofore appropriated for this project shall be classified under and combined with these amounts and shall be expendable only for the specific purposes set forth in this paragraph, subject to determination by the Comptroller General;"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$42,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 133: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,611,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 134: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$146,357,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 136: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$54,786,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "; *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate Canyon Ferry Reservoir at a higher maximum normal pool elevation than three thousand seven hundred and sixty-six feet, unless and until new land in Broadwater County, Montana, equal in acreage to the irrigated land to be inundated in Canyon Ferry Reservoir above elevation of 3,766 feet is provided with facilities for irrigation; or for or in connection with the acquisition or installation of the power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out

by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"ALASKAN INVESTIGATIONS

"For engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water-power resources of Alaska, $150,000, which shall be available for, but not restricted to, services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rations and quarters for field parties while away from inhabited communities in which such facilities are available."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Not exceeding eight per centum of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed $200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 155: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$540,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$592,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 161: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 164: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$602,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 166: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,027,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "eighty, of which thirty shall be"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$765,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$665,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$790,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$137,951"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 200: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,147,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 201: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 201, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$510,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 203: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 203, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 206: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 209: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,312,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 213: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 213, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "not exceeding 35 per centum of the amount allocated to any State shall be available for the construction of buildings: *Provided further*, That the requirement of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, that not exceeding 20 per centum of the amount allocated to any State shall be available for the construction of improvements is hereby waived with respect to unobligated balances on June 30, 1948"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 215: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,123,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 216: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 216, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "sixty-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 217: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 217, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 218: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "hire (in Alaska),"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 219: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 219, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2.00"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 227: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 227, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 232: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 232, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 233: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 233, and

agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Board on Geographic Names, $150;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 234: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 234, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 235: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 235, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 236: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 236, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 237: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 237, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 238: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 238, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 239: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 239, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 240: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 240, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,375"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 241: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 241, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 242: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 242, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "unless a higher rate is otherwise authorized by law or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 84, 101, 125, 126, 150, 151, 152, 178, 189, 190, 199, 211, 212, 214, and 231.

BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1, 2, and 3, relating to the Office of the Secretary: Permits employment of such personnel outside the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,115,842, for such office, instead of $965,842, as proposed by the House, and $1,250,000, as proposed by the Senate; and permits the use of $50,000 for the Division of Power, instead of $75,000, as proposed by the Senate, and a prohibition against the use of any funds for such purpose, as proposed by the House.

No. 4, relating to the Office of the Solicitor: Appropriates $250,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $220,225, as proposed by the House.

No. 5, relating to salaries and expenses, Division of Territories and Island Possessions: Appropriates $160,000, instead of $146,800, as proposed by the House, and $185,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 6 and 7, relating to the Oil and Gas Division: Authorizes the purchase of four passenger vehicles, as proposed by the Senate, instead of two, as proposed by the House; and appropriates $325,000, for such division, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the House, and $350,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 8, relating to salaries and expenses, soil and moisture conservation operations: Appropriates $2,800,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,700,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 9 and 10, relating to contingent expenses, Department of the Interior: Appropriates $215,000, instead of $205,730, as proposed by the House, and $230,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 11 and 12, relating to expenses, power transmission facilities: Provides funds for expenses in connection with the supervision of contracts executed prior to June 30, 1948, as proposed by the Senate, instead of "1947", as proposed by the House; and provides for terminal leave payments to employees on furlough from active duty, as proposed by the Senate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, relating to Bonneville Power Administration: Appropriates $21,125,700, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,920,760, as proposed by the House; provides that $3,231,800 shall be available for operation and maintenance and administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House; authorizes the purchase of eight motor vehicles, instead of five, as proposed by the House, and ten, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the Administrator to contract for "services", as proposed by the Senate; provides contract authorization in the sum of $11,888,500, instead of $10,269,290, as proposed by the House, and $12,046,500, as proposed by the Senate; restores the House provision relating to force account work amended to allow eight per centum of funds appropriated for construction for such work, in lieu of the Senate proposal; and restores the provision of the House relating to the disposition of interest collected by Bonneville Power Administration from sales of electric energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam on the unamortized balance of investment allocated to power, amended to make such provision effective during the fiscal year 1949.

The use of funds or of contract authorization for the Lebanon and Coos Bay substations mentioned on page 8 of the House Report and on pages 3 and 4 of the Senate Report has been disapproved by the conferees. The conferees approve the table of allocations as submitted by Bonneville Power Administration appearing at page 1540 of the Senate hearings with the following changes:

	Cash	Contract authorization
(1) Changes in amounts recommended for use on 230,000-volt facilities to maintain schedules coordinated with installation of new generating capacity (groups I, IA, and IB)	−$40,860	+$929,210
(2) Olympia-Shelton-Port Angeles line (item IA-3)	----------	−25,000
(3) Olympia-Shelton line No. 2	−9,000	----------
(4) Beverly Park-Snohomish circuit No. 1	+170,000	----------
(5) Beverly Park-Snohomish circuit No. 2	----------	+54,000
(6) Forest Grove-McMinnville-Salem line (item IB-9)	−70,000	+70,000
(7) Canby substation (I4-14)	−25,000	----------
(8) Spokane-Colville-Spirit line (item IIA-2)	−52,000	−50,000
(9) Cottage Grove-Drain facility (item IC-4)	−50,000	+50,000
(10) McKinley-Gold Beach interconnection	+50,000	+280,000
(11) Idaho Panhandle (Sand Point-Bonners Ferry)	----------	+161,000
(12) Columbia-Ellensburg line (item IIC-2)	----------	+150,000
Recommended adjustments in construction program	−26,860	+1,619,210
Recommended increase in operations and maintenance limitation	231,800	----------
Net changes from House bill	+204,940	+1,619,210

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28: Appropriates $1,000,000 for salaries and expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate, and $900,000 as proposed by the House; and strikes out the word "only" following the words "District of Columbia" as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,562,565, as proposed by the House, for management, protection, and disposal of public lands; authorizes the purchase of 15 motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 10 as proposed by the House; and provides that no part of the appropriations in the Act shall be used for salaries of personnel in regional offices in excess of the average total of such personnel during the fiscal year 1948, in lieu of the House provision eliminating such regional offices; appropriates $500,000 for revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, Oregon, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $469,300 as proposed by the House; strikes out the provision of the House prohibiting the transfer of activities to the field, as proposed by the Senate; and inserts the provision of the Senate relating to the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, instead of the proposal of the House.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

No. 29: Appropriates $200,000 for salaries and expenses, District Offices, in lieu of $600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum recommended provides $110,000 for a District office at Billings, Montana, and $90,000 for a similar office at Portland, Oregon, for special activities and functions applicable to those areas.

No. 30: Appropriates $2,400,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,200,000

as proposed by the Senate for salaries and expenses, reservation administration. The conferees approve the recommendations contained on page 15 of the House Committee report (No. 2038) with reference to maintenance of the agencies and subagencies in Oklahoma and the keeping of the enumerated records at such agencies and subagencies.

No. 31: Appropriates $125,000 for maintenance of law and order instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 32 and 33: Appropriates $4,118,962 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,518,762 as proposed by the House, for the Alaska Native Service and inserts the word "vessels" in such item as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriates $907,900 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,907,900 as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the contract authorization of not to exceed $3,350,000 proposed by the Senate amendment for construction and maintenance service, Navajo and Hopi Service. In connection with these decreases, the conferees wish to point out that the proposed increase was submitted in a supplemental estimate which went to the Senate and on which the House had no opportunity to hold hearings or give consideration. For this reason the conference committee decided that the request for additional funds and contract authorization should be deferred.

No. 36: Appropriates $4,334,115 for agency services of the Navajo and Hopi Service, instead of $3,748,615 as proposed by the House, and $4,584,115 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase of $585,500 in the House bill, $56,500 is provided for purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, $29,000 for education, and $500,000 for welfare work. Conferees request that the Indian Bureau submit a report to the Congress early in the next regular session on conditions as to the general welfare of the Navajo and Hopi Indians.

No. 37: Corrects a total.

No. 38: Appropriates $755,000 for maintenance of buildings and utilities instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House and $810,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 39 and 40: Appropriates $10,100,000 for education of Indians, instead of $9,574,709 as proposed by the House, and $10,376,000, as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase in the House bill, $200,000 is provided for education of Navajo students, $125,000 is for State educational contracts and $15,000 for equipment at the Anadarko Arts and Craft Building, Oklahoma.

No. 41: Appropriates $900,000 for management, Indian Forest and Range Resources, instead of $711,687 as proposed by the House, and $950,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 42: Restores the House provision relating to a revolving fund for loans to Indians, in lieu of the Senate amendment.

Nos. 43, 44, 45, 46, and 47: Relating to construction, irrigation systems; appropriates $2,600,000 for Colorado River, Arizona, instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,700,000 as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $190,000 for payment to the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of March 7, 1947, and $60,000 for miscellaneous small projects instead of $25,000, as proposed by the House, and $90,000 as proposed by the Senate; restores the provision of the House limiting personal services in the District of Columbia to not exceeding $12,500; and corrects the total of such items.

Nos. 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 59: Relating to construction of building and utilities: Appropriates $622,500 for such work in Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $222,500, as proposed by the House; appropriates $125,000 for buildings, and so forth, Celilo Falls, Oregon, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $79,000 for sewage works, as proposed by the Senate, and $75,000 for water supply as proposed by the Senate, instead of $35,000 as proposed by the House, at the Cherokee, North Carolina reservation; appropriates $213,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $85,000, as proposed by the House, for construction of school buildings for the consolidated Chippewa Indians, Minnesota, as authorized by Public Law 231, Eightieth Congress; appropriates $35,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,000 as proposed by the House, for a school building at Walker, Minnesota; appropriates $750,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, for a tubercular sanatorium at Galen, Montana; appropriates $80,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House, for a building for the Hunter School District, Sawyer County, Wisconsin; appropriates $250,000 for a school building for the school district of Roosevelt, Utah, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $200,000 for school building in Owyhee, Nevada, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $300,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $300,000 for miscellaneous repairs and improvements, instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House, and $400,000 as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total appropriation for such items.

No. 60: Appropriates $2,500,000 for roads, Indian reservations, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,894,400, as proposed by the Senate; the conferees have approved work to be prosecuted on the Ethete Road, Wyoming, and have also approved the provision in the House report recommending $150,000 for road construction on the Sprague River Road on the Klamath Indian Reservation. In connection with the latter item, it is understood that the states will match these amounts equally, thus providing a total of $300,000 for this work.

Nos. 61 and 62, relating to the Klamath Agency, Oregon, tribal funds: The amendments restore the provisons and amounts in identical form as provided in the House bill.

Nos. 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68: Appropriates $138,875 for support of Menominee Agency and pay of tribal officers, instead of $162,250 as proposed by the House, and $215,500 as proposed by the Senate; and adjust the amounts available to provide $36,500 for relief of such Indians, $5,500 for compensation and expenses of attorney; limits to $10,000 the amount available for salaries and expenses of certain Menominee representatives, as proposed by the Senate; and provides for the appointment of a recreational director, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 69: Inserts the language of the Senate providing a total of $197,000 for support of the Osage Agency, in lieu of the language of the House providing a total of the same amount for such purpose.

No. 70: Appropriates $50,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $73,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of tribal council officers in a travel status.

No. 71: Appropriates $82,880 for compensation and expenses of attorneys, instead of $62,080, as proposed by the House. The proposed increase of $20,800, covering compensation under approved contracts, was submitted to the Senate after the bill had passed the House and into which the House conferees have not had an opportunity to examine.

Nos. 72, 73, 74, 76, and 76: Relating to industrial assistance, tribal funds: Appropriates $350,000, instead of $277,500 as proposed by the House, and $422,500, as proposed by the Senate, and adjusts such total amount to provide $167,500 for the Menominee Indians, Wisconsin, $20,000 for the Nez Perce Indians, Idaho, $50,000 for the Standing Rock Indians, North Dakota, and $75,000 for the Blackfeet Indians, Montana.

Nos. 77 and 78: Authorizes the purchase of 200 passenger motor vehicles, instead of 100 as proposed by the House, and 250 as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 79 and 80: Permits the use of funds for salaries and expenses, reservation administration, for the hire of aircraft, instead of limiting such use to maintenance and operation as proposed by the House.

Appropriations for Indians in Oklahoma: The conferees are in agreement with the provision and recommendations set forth on pages 17 and 18 of the House Report on the bill, House Report No. 2038, which breaks down the appropriations available to the State of Oklahoma into miscellaneous items covering schools, agencies, hospitals, and so forth. Where the conferees have increased amounts for activities above the amounts allowed in the House bill, it is the understanding of the conferees that such funds shall be distributed proportionately in order that Indians in Oklahoma will receive their equal share of the increases.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Nos. 81, 82, and 83, relating to administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of one hundred and twenty-five motor vehicles, instead of three hundred, as proposed by the Senate; provides for the hire of aircraft, and eliminates authority for acquisition of aircraft from other government agencies; and inserts a limitation of $100,000 to the Senate provision relating to the employment of consultants.

No. 84: Reported in disagreement.

Nos. 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91, relating to salaries and expenses: Appropriates $3,600,000, instead of $3,161,472, as proposed by the House, and $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the transfer of $7,800,000 for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects, instead of $6,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $8,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House restricting the use of funds for salaries of personnel engaged in obtaining power contracts with customers already supplied, with the understanding, however, that the conferees are in general agreement with the objectives set forth in such amendment, and it is directed by the conferees that the Bureau curb activities of the nature which have given rise to the widespread opinion that its employees have been unduly aggressive in offering the extension of services which are often in direct or implied competition with existing private facilities. In connection with amendments 88 and 89, relating to the prohibition against the use of funds for certain employees without certain qualifications, the House has accepted the Senate amendments making the date effective "after January 31, 1949", and requiring that such employees have five years' engineering and administrative experience, instead of ten years' experience, as proposed by the House. In connection with amendment No. 90, the conferees have restored the provision of the House amended to fix such limitation of funds available at $48,000,000, instead of $45,341,615, as proposed by the House. In connection with amendment No. 91, the conferees have recommended restoration of the House provision amended to limit the number of such employees to 3,500, instead of 3,251, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 92, 93, 94, and 95, relating to general investigations: Appropriates $3,500,000, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the Senate to make such funds available until expended,

and inserts the word "construction", as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107, relating to construction, from the reclamation fund: Appropriates $1,000,000 for the Santa Barbara County project, California, Cachuma Unit, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, and restores the provision of the House authorizing a contract authorization, amended to allow $1,600,000, instead of $1,500,000, such funds being provided for construction of tunnel and conduit and acquisition of right-of-way; appropriates $1,525,000 for the Boise project, Idaho, Payette division, instead of $1,400,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,650,000, as proposed by the Senate; eliminates the provision of the House requiring completion of the Lewiston Orchards project, Idaho; increases the limitation on the amount available for surveys, Minidoka project, Idaho, to $147,500; reports the contract authorization for the Palisades project, Idaho, in technical disagreement; appropriates $1,293,000 for the Tucumcari project, New Mexico; appropriates $57,985 for the Rio Grande project, New Mexico–Texas; appropriates $1,980,000 for the Provo River project, Utah, as proposed by the House; appropriates $1,298,650 for the Yakima project, Washington, Roza division; appropriates $1,780,175 for the Riverton project, Wyoming; and corrects the total of such items.

Nos. 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, and 124, relating to operation and maintenance: Authorizes the use of $2,645,380 from power revenues for the Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California; appropriates $230,437 for operation of the Central Valley project, California, and $814,400 from power revenues; appropriates $220,000 for the Boise project, Idaho; authorizes the use of $447,500 from power revenues for the Minidoka project, Idaho; authorizes the use of $175,500 from power revenues in connection with the North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming; appropriates $101,250 for the Deschutes project, Oregon; appropriates $292,500 for the Owyhee project, Oregon; appropriates $217,000 for the Klamath project, Oregon-California; authorizes the use of $1,645,000 from power revenues for the Columbia Basin project, Washington, and strikes out the provision of the Senate authorizing the payment of tuition for children of employees; appropriates $337,500 for the Yakima project, Washington; authorizes the use of $206,250 from power revenues for the Kendrick project, Wyoming; appropriates $93,700 for the Riverton project, Wyoming, and authorizes the use of $57,212 from power revenues on such project; and appropriates $77,200 for the Shoshone project, Wyoming, and authorizes the use of $104,800 from power revenues on such project.

Nos. 125 and 126: Reported in disagreement.

Nos. 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, and 134, relating to construction from the general fund: Appropriates $2,470,000 for the Gila project, instead of $2,240,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,700,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $22,125,000 for the Davis Dam project, Arizona, instead of $18,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $22,884,300, as proposed by the Senate; with the understanding that funds available for the construction of transmission lines shall be used only for backbone or main transmission lines now under construction or under contract; appropriates $212,000 for the Parker Dam power project, instead of $190,000, as proposed by the House, and $234,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $41,358,900 for the Central Valley project, California, instead of $40,000,400, as proposed by the House, and $42,467,400, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $42,500 for the Kern River project, California, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the House, and $45,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $20,225,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, instead of $19,750,000, as proposed by the House, and $20,700,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $14,611,650 for the Hungry Horse project, Montana, instead of $8,100,000, as proposed by the House, and $15,115,500, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total of such items.

No. 135: Appropriates $990,000 for the Fort Peck project, Montana, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,980,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 136, 137, and 138, relating to the Missouri River Basin: Appropriates $54,786,650 for this project, instead of $52,767,500, as proposed by the House, and $56,275,800, as proposed by the Senate; restores the provision of the House amended to provide that new land in Broadwater County, Mont., shall be provided equal to the acreage to be inundated in Canyon Ferry Reservoir; and restores the language of the House relating to construction of power facilities amended to cover the acquisition or installation of the power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana; and inserts the proposal of the Senate that no part of the appropriation may be used for surveys, etc., in connection with the Glendo project, Wyoming, to a greater capacity or other purposes than set forth in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, without specific authorization of Congress.

A break-down by projects of the amounts approved by the conferees is as follows:

Unit location	*Amount approved by conferees*
Phase A, units selected for construction:	
Angostura, S. Dak	$3,120,000
Bostwick, Nebr.-Kans	2,600,000
Boysen, Wyo	6,000,000
Belle Fourche, Wyo	550,000
Cannonball, N. Dak	580,000
Canyon Ferry, Mont	2,950,000
Cedar Bluff, Kans	1,750,000
Frenchman-Cambridge, Nebr	7,505,000
Glendo, Wyo	850,000
Grand River, S. Dak	1,560,000
Heart River (Heart-Butte and Dickinson Dams), N. Dak. (Including $1,893,850 for Heart-Butte Dam and $412,300 for Dickinson Dam)	2,306,150
Kortes, Wyo	4,085,000
Lower Marias, Mont	450,000
Missouri-Souris, Mont.-N. Dak	287,500
Moreau River, S. Dak	847,750
Narrows, Colo	1,650,000
Powder River, Wyo.-Mont	850,000
Region 6 headquarters, Montana	5,000
St. Francis, Colo.-Kans	1,700,000
Transmission lines (see table)	4,250,350
Yellowstone pumping, Montana-North Dakota	565,000
Operation and maintenance during construction	42,500
Subtotal, phase A	44,504,250
Phase B, units being prepared for construction:	
Bad River, S. Dak	$9,250
Bighorn pumping, Wyoming	20,000
Columbus, Nebr	175,000
Grand Island, Nebr	412,500
Hardin, Mont	500,000
Jefferson River, Mont	82,500
Lower Marias, Mont	300,000
Middle Loup, Nebr	255,000
Missouri-Souris, Mont.-N. Dak	700,000
Montana pumping, Montana	210,000
North Dakota pumping, North Dakota	42,500
Oahe-James River, S. Dak	360,000
Owl Creek, Wyo	200,000
Rapid Valley, S. Dak	47,250
Shoshone extensions, Wyoming	150,000
South Dakota pumping, South Dakota	26,000
Sun River, Mont	40,000
Tongue River, Wyo	65,100
White River, S. Dak	35,000
Wind River, Wyo	16,500
Subtotal, phase B	3,846,600
Phase C, continuing work on the general plan of development:	
Big Horn Basin, Wyo.-Mont	56,000
Cheyenne River, S. Dak	24,500
Clarks Fort, Wyo.-Mont	4,200
Garrison diversion, North Dakota	54,600
Helena Valley, Mont	21,000
Judith River, Mont	10,500
Kansas Basin, Colo.-Nebr.-Kans	280,000
Little Missouri, N. Dak	10,500
Lower Platte Basin, Nebr	490,000
Nilan, Mont	5,600
Niobrara Basin, Wyo.-Nebr	140,000
North Platte Basin, Colo.-Nebr.-Wyo	126,000
North Republican, Colo.-Nebr	3,800
South Platte Basin, Colo.-Wyo.-Nebr	210,000
Three Forks, Mont	299,600
Upper Marias, Mont	35,000
Wilson, Kans	70,000
General:	
Power studies, region VI	21,000
Reports staff, region VI	70,000
Subtotal, phase C	1,938,300
Phase D, cooperation with Corps of Engineers	77,500
Other Department of Interior agencies:	
Bureau of Land Management	390,000
Bureau of Mines	150,000
Fish and Wildlife Service	425,000
Geological Survey	3,305,000
National Park Service	185,000
Office of Indian Affairs	165,000
Subtotals, other agencies	4,620,000
Grand total, Missouri River program	54,786,650
Region VII:	
Transmission lines:	
Gering-Sidney	343,000
Sidney-Sterling	314,000
Sterling?North Platte	54,000
Gering-Hot Springs	175,400
Cheyenne-Sterling	139,850
Casper-Gering	451,100
Fort Randall-O'Neil	195,300
Glendo-Lusk	102,700

Unit location	Amount approved by conferees
Region VII—Continued	
Substations:	
Sterling	$52,700
Sidney	163,500
Ogallala	24,000
Pine Bluffs-Kimball	50,000
O'Neil	67,700
Guernsey	2,700
Caspar subadditions	180,000
Goring subadditions	245,450
Bridgeport	79,050
Lusk	42,000
Alliance, Chadron and Hot Springs	128,100
Total, region VII	2,810,550
Region VI, transmission lines and substations:	
Williston-Garrison	720,850
Williston substation	102,700
Beulah substation	102,700
Heart River-Heart Butte	277,050
Boysen lines	56,750
Canyon Ferry lines	2,700
REA and pumping	177,050
Total, region VI	1,439,800
Grand total, transmission lines and substations	4,250,350

Nos. 139, 140, and 141, relating to investigations, Colorado River development fund: Appropriates $900,000, as proposed by the Senate, and inserts the word "construction" in connection with estimates of costs of projects, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 142, relating to the Boulder Canyon project, operation and maintenance: Strikes out the proposal of the House in connection with payment of tuition of children of employees, and inserts the proposal of the Senate.

No. 143, relating to construction, Boulder Canyon project: Appropriates $1,700,000, instead of $1,600,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,728,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 144: Appropriates $4,000,000 for the All-American Canal, as proposed by the House, instead of $4,242,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 145: Strikes out the proposal of the House relating to a moratorium or stop order by the President in connection with the use of appropriations for flood control or reclamation.

No. 146: Restores the provision of the House relating to Alaskan investigations amended to include the words "as a basis for legislation".

No. 147: Restores the provision of the House relating to contract hold-backs.

No. 148: In eliminating this provision from the bill the conferees are in agreement that new legislation shall be passed at the earliest opportunity providing for the disposal of the interest collected on sums invested in power and municipal water features on reclamation projects, and with the understanding that interest heretofore or hereafter collected on such investment in power or municipal water features of any such reclamation project constructed or operated under the authority of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 shall not be allocated during the fiscal year 1949.

No. 149: Restores the provision of the House relating to force account work amended to limit such restriction to eight per centum and excepts certain projects or items not in excess of $200,000.

No. 150: Reported in disagreement.

No. 151: Reported in disagreement.

No. 152: Reported in disagreement.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

No. 153 authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 166 passenger motor vehicles (of which 146 are for replacement only) as proposed by the Senate, instead of the purchase of 146 for replacement only as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 154 and 155 appropriates $4,350,000 for topographic surveys, instead of $3,563,498 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $540,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia instead of $505,000, as proposed by the House, and $573,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 156 and 157 appropriates $2,625,000 for geologic surveys, instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $592,500 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia instead of $585,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 158, 159, and 160 appropriates $3,496,700 for gaging streams as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,034,800 as proposed by the House, of which $2,361,900 is to be available only for work in cooperation with States or municipalities as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House, and of which not to exceed $300,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia instead of $265,000 as proposed by the House and $350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 161 and 162 appropriates $300,000 for classification of lands, instead of $243,400 as proposed by the House and $325,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $65,725 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate instead of $56,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 163 and 164 appropriates $602,950 for printing and binding, instead of $477,950 as proposed by the House and $700,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which $450,000 is for engraving and printing geologic and topographic maps instead of $325,000 as proposed by the House and $547,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 165 appropriates $690,000 for mineral leasing as proposed by the Senate, instead of $675,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 166 adjusts the total recommended for all items under salaries and expenses to $13,027,000, instead of $11,456,998 as proposed by the House and $13,924,050 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

Amendment No. 167 provides, as proposed by the Senate, that not to exceed $16,000 of the appropriation for control of fires in inactive coal deposits may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Amendment No. 168 provides that not to exceed $150,000 of the appropriation for coal-mine inspections and investigations may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate, instead of $145,000 for such purpose as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 169 provides that not to exceed $25,000 of the appropriation for anthracite mining investigations may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 170 and 171 appropriates $9,750,000 for synthetic liquid fuels as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,250,000 as proposed by the House, of which not to exceed $100,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the House, instead of $140,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 172 and 173 appropriates $300,000 for coal investigations as proposed by the House, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $45,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the House, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 174 inserts, as proposed by the Senate, the word "construction" in the text of the language of the appropriation for mining experiment stations in order to clarify the purposes for which the appropriation may be used.

Amendment Nos. 175 and 176 correct errors in spelling.

Amendment No. 177 makes the appropriations for the Bureau available for the purchase of not to exceed 80 passenger motor vehicles (of which 30 are for replacement only), instead of the purchase of not to exceed 60 for replacement only as proposed by the House and the purchase of not to exceed 100 (of which 94 are for replacement only) as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 178 is reported in disagreement.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Amendment Nos. 179 and 180 appropriates $765,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of $737,818 as proposed by the House and $800,000 as proposed by the Senate, including $100,000 for printing and binding as proposed by the Senate instead of $87,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 181 appropriates $665,000 for regional offices, instead of $615,290 as proposed by the House and $715,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 182 appropriates $3,750,000 for administration and protection and so forth of national parks, instead of $3,658,163 as proposed by the House and $3,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 183 appropriates $1,625,000 for administration and protection of national monument, historical and military areas, instead of $1,556,464 as proposed by the House and $1,690,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed that not to exceed $20,000 of the total appropriation recommended may be used for administration of the Fort Sumter National Monument.

Amendment No. 184 appropriates $300,000 for recreational areas, instead of $273,495 as proposed by the House and $350,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed that not to exceed $20,000 (additional) of the total appropriation recommended is for Lake Texoma, Tex., and Okla.; for additional work at this area.

Amendment No. 185 appropriates $60,000 for the Travel Division as proposed by the House, instead of $75,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 186 appropriates $10,000 for administration and protection of recreational demonstration areas as proposed by the House, instead of $15,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 187 appropriates $790,000 for salaries and expenses, National Capitol parks, instead of $774,150 as proposed by the House and $815,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 188 appropriates $137,954 for investigations and studies of the recreational resources and the archeological remains in the river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin), instead of $122,954 as proposed by the House and $152,954 as proposed by the Senate. The total appropriation recommended includes funds for archeological work in the Fort Gibson Reservoir area, Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 189 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 190 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment Nos. 191, 192, and 193 appropriates $4,762,350, as proposed by the Senate, for construction and maintenance of roads and trails and construction and repair of buildings and utilities, instead of $5,162,350 for such purposes as proposed by the House; provides that $3,110,000 of such amount shall be allocated for roads and trails as proposed by the Senate, instead of

$3,210,000 as proposed by the House; and further provides that $1,652,350 of such amount shall be allocated for buildings and utilities as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,952,350 as proposed by the House. The amount recommended is $400,000 below the appropriation proposed by the House, of which $100,000 is applicable to roads and trails for Alaska and $300,000 is applicable to physical improvements for Alaska.

Amendment No. 194 makes appropriations of the National Park Service available for the purchase of not to exceed 40 passenger motor vehicles (of which 28 are for replacement only) as proposed by the Senate, instead of the purchase of not to exceed 30 for replacement only as proposed by the House.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Amendment No. 195 appropriates $270,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $247,470 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 196, 197, and 198 appropriate $1,879,525 for propagation of food fishes as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,800,525 as proposed by the House, including not to exceed $2,000 for purchase of certain specified land as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,500 as proposed by the House; also effects a minor change in language in conformity with the change in the total.

Amendment No. 199 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 200 appropriates $1,147,500 for investigations respecting food fishes, instead of $1,025,000 as proposed by the House and $1,224,500 as proposed by the Senate. The amount recommended is $122,500 above the bill as passed by the House for the following purposes: (1) $15,000 for operation of fishery research vessel, Albatross III; (2) $50,000 for Alaska fishery research (exclusive of construction of laboratory); (3) $20,000 for investigation of damaged oyster beds in Mississippi and Louisiana; and (4) $37,500 for studies of soft-shelled and hard-shelled clams.

Amendment No. 201 appropriates $510,000 for commercial fisheries, instead of $495,000 as proposed by the House and $525,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 202 appropriates $1,000,000 for investigation, exploration, and development of Pacific fisheries as proposed by the House, instead of $1,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 203 appropriates $60,000 for Alaska fur-seal investigations, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $69,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 204 corrects a typographical error.

Amendment No. 205 appropriates $225,000 for enforcement of the Alaska game law as proposed by the Senate, instead of $175,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 206, 207, 208, and 209 appropriates $1,312,500 for maintenance of mammal and bird reservations, instead of $1,210,000 as proposed by the House and $1,340,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not exceeding $7,500 (instead of $5,000 proposed by the House and $10,000 proposed by the Senate) may be used for the repair, painting, and maintenance of dwellings and the buildings and facilities on the Chinsegut National Wildlife Reservation. The total amount recommended for this appropriation also includes $100,000 (instead of $125,000 proposed by the Senate) to repair flood damage in certain areas due to excessive run-off of water during the spring of 1948.

Amendment No. 210 appropriates $150,000 for river basin studies as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 211 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 212 (relating to a total) is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 213, relating to the special fund for Federal aid in wildlife restoration restores the provision in the House bill limiting expenditures for construction from State allocations for fiscal year 1949 to 35 per centum of any such allocation, amended to make the restriction applicable only to construction of "buildings", and waiving a similar restriction carried in the 1948 appropriation act with respect to unobligated balances on June 30, 1948, from State allotments for fiscal year 1948.

Amendment No. 214 (relating to a total) is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 215 authorizes the use of not to exceed $1,123,000 under the various appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service for departmental personal services, instead of $1,113,862 as proposed by the House and $1,130,112 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 216 makes funds available for the Fish and Wildlife Service available for the purchase of not to exceed 65 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, instead of 50 as proposed by the House and 86 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 217 and 218 makes funds available for the work of the Fish and Wildlife Service available for the purchase of not to exceed 3 aircraft, instead of 2 as proposed by the House and 5 as proposed by the Senate; and permits the hire of aircraft by the Service, as proposed by the Senate, amended to restrict such hiring to the Territory of Alaska.

Amendment No. 219 sets at $2.00 the maximum per man per day commutation of rations of vessel employees of the Service, instead of $1.50 as proposed by the House and $2.50 as proposed by the Senate.

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 220 appropriates $64,500 for salaries and expenses, offices of the Governor and the Secretary, Territory of Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $62,785 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 221 appropriates $448,000 for care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane in Alaska as proposed by the Senate, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 222 and 223 appropriates $10,442,400 for construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, trails, and so forth, Territory of Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,500,000 as proposed by the House; and authorizes contractual obligations in the amount of $13,904,000 for such purposes, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 224, 225, 226, 227, and 228, relating to the Alaska Railroad: appropriates $17,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House; authorizes contractual obligations of $12,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,700,000 as proposed by the House; provides that not to exceed $12,000 of the appropriation shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $6,575 as proposed by the House and $15,000 as proposed by the Senate; retains the limitation of $8,500 as proposed by the House (the Senate had proposed $9,000) on the annual salary to be paid out of this appropriation to anyone other than the general manager of the Railroad and one assistant general manager; and provides that not to exceed $22,500 of the Alaska Railroad funds shall be available for printing and binding, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 229 appropriates $25,900 for salaries and expenses, offices of the Governor and the Secretary, Territory of Hawaii, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 230 appropriates $213,000 for salaries and expenses, Government of the Virgin Islands, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $205,050 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 231 is reported in disagreement.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment Nos. 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, and 240 amend section 4 of the general provisions by providing that appropriations in the bill for the several bureaus and offices shall be available for expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of members of societies or associations concerned with their work in not to exceed the following amounts: Office of the Secretary, $850 (House $600; Senate $1,100); Oil and Gas Division, $100; Board on Geographic Names, $150 (Senate, $300); Bureau of Land Management, $1,000 (House, $300; Senate, $2,500); Bureau of Indian Affairs, $1,250 (House, $1,000; Senate, $1,500); Bureau of Reclamation, $6,750 (House, $6,000; Senate, $7,500); Geological Survey, $4,750 (House, $2,000; Senate, $7,500); Bureau of Mines, $5,000 (House, $4,000; Senate, $6,000); National Park Service, $1,250 (House, $1,000; Senate, $1,500); Fish and Wildlife Service, $2,375 (House, $1,750; Senate, $3,000); and soil and moisture conservation operations (all bureaus), $500.

Amendment No. 241 authorizes not to exceed a total of $875,000 of the appropriations contained in the bill to be available for compensation of employees engaged in personnel work, instead of a limitation of $750,000 proposed by the House for such work and $1,000,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 242 inserts language proposed by the Senate in the provision which limits per diem rates for services of experts to $35 under certain conditions, so as to provide that such rate shall apply "unless a higher rate is otherwise authorized by law"; the language permitting the Director of the Budget to approve rates up to $50 per day is also retained in the bill.

Amendment No. 243 restores to the bill certain rescissions, aggregating $560,197, as proposed by the House.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 84, relating to authorization for Bureau of Reclamation to make payments to school districts for instruction of dependents of employees and contractors on reclamation construction projects: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 101, providing a contract authorization of $2,000,000 for construction on the Palisades project, Idaho, under the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 125, providing funds for rehabilitation and betterment of existing reclamation projects: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

The proposal of the Senate is a new program not heretofore undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation. The conferees on the part of the House will insist that each project be authorized by basic legislation and that such legislation be enacted before additional funds are provided.

Amendment No. 126, relating to a total: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 150, providing for the transfer of certain land at the Grand Island Army Air Field to the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 151, providing for the transfer of certain unexpended balances of property management funds from the War Assets Administration to the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 152, providing for the transfer of a certain parcel of land from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 178, providing authority for the transfer of a certain parcel of land from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Interior: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 189, providing funds for acquisition of lands by the National Park Service: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 190, providing a contract authorization for construction of certain parkways, National Park Service: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 199, clarifying the language of an appropriation as to its availablity for construction of certain fish cultural facilities, Fish and Wildlife Service: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 211, providing for purchase and operation of wildlife management areas in California: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

This is a cooperative effort for which the State of California has arranged by legislative action for an appropriation of $9,000,000 over a three year period. A special act has been passed by Congress, (Public Law 534, 80th Congress), which provides for this special situation. The conferees do not intend by approving this special situation that the action shall be regarded as a precedent.

Amendment No. 212, adjusts a total: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 214, adjusts a total: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 231, appropriating to meet deficits of municipal governments of the Virgin Islands and authorizing them to make purchases for certain of their public institutions through the Federal Bureau of Supply: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 84, 101, 125, 150, 151, 152, 178, 190, 199, and 231 be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 84: Page 39, line 20, insert "payments (not to exceed the average per pupil cost in the State where construction is in progress) to school districts as reimbursement, while projects are actually under construction, for the instruction of dependents of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and of contractors engaged on such projects: *Provided*, That a tuition charge of $25 per semester shall be charged and collected by the Bureau of Reclamation for each such dependent attending such schools.

Amendment No. 101: Page 44, line 14, insert:

"Palisades project, Idaho, the Commissioner of Reclamation is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $2,000,000."

Amendment No. 125: Page 48, line 24, insert:

"REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT

"For rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects, $1,500,000: *Provided*, That, at the discretion of the Secretary, repayment may be scheduled after the completion of repayment of existing obligations of the water users' organizations concerned."

Amendment No. 150: Page 61, line 11, insert:

"The War Assets Administration or other Federal agency having ownership or custody thereof or interest therein is hereby directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation without exchange of funds, the following-described lands, together with improvements, buildings, facilities, equipment, and interest."

Amendment No. 151: Page 62, line 20, insert:

"The War Assets Administration is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation unexpended balances of funds available for maintenance and protection of transferred property under the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act of 1947 (Public Law 478, 79th Cong.) to reimburse the Bureau of Reclamation for expenditures made for the maintenance and protection of the Yuma Army Air Base and such transfer shall be made hereafter for the maintenance and protection of the Yuma Army Air Base, pending its final disposition as contemplated in the Interior Appropriation Act of 1948 (Public Law 247, 80th Cong., 1st sess.)."

Amendment No. 152: Page 63, line 7, insert:

"The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, all of its right, title, and interest in and to a certain building and improvements under Defense Plant Corporation project, Plancor 1437, constructed on the War Relocation Center at the Heart Mountain Division of the Shoshone project, Wyoming."

Senate amendment No. 178: On page 81, line 5, insert the following:

"The Department of the Army is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior, for the use of the Bureau of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction, possession, and control of a parcel of 10 acres, more or less, from that portion of Fort Douglas Military Reservation in the county of Salt Lake, State of Utah, which lies immediately north of the site of the Bureau of Mines Intermountain Experiment Station and is situated between a line beginning at a point 400 feet north of the northwest corner of the United States Bureau of Mines property granted by deed from the University of Utah May 21, 1938, said point being on the south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard and running thence south 320 feet to the east-west boundary line between the University of Utah and Fort Douglas; thence east 604⅛ feet to the north-south boundary between the University of Utah and Fort Douglas; thence south along said north-south boundary 480 feet to a line on the south boundary (extended) of the United States Bureau of Mines property above mentioned; thence east 262 feet; thence north 952⅛ feet to the south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard; thence westerly along said south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard to the point of beginning, said enclosure embracing 10 acres."

Senate amendment No. 190: On page 86, line 16, insert the following:

"Parkways, National Park Service: The Secretary is hereby authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts, not exceeding a total of $2,680,000, for the construction of the Blue Ridge, Natchez Trace, George Washington Memorial, and Foothills Parkways."

Senate amendment No. 199: On page 90, line 2, after the word "thereto" insert the following: "and not to exceed $35,000 for the construction and operation, in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), of fish cultural facilities on lands owned by the State of South Dakota."

Senate amendment No. 231: On page 106, strike out lines 12 to 18, inclusive, and insert:

"Municipal governments: For expenses of the government of the Virgin Islands in excess of current local revenues for the fiscal year 1949, municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, $194,400, and municipality of St. Croix, $325,800; in all, $520,200, to be paid to the respective municipal treasuries in monthly installments; and the said municipal governments are hereby authorized to make purchases for their hospitals, schools, and other public institutions, through the Bureau of Federal Supply of the Treasury Department."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 84, 101, 125, 150, 151, 152, 178, 190, 199, and 231, and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 126: On page 50, line 3, strike out "$30,605,997" and insert "$37,308,855."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$34,132,439."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 189: Page 85, line 23, insert:

"Acquisition of lands: For the acquisition of privately owned lands or interests therein within the authorized boundaries of established areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including expenses incidental thereto and personal services in the District of Columbia, $200,000, to remain available until expended, of which $150,000 shall be available only for lands within Colonial National Historical Park; Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial and Gettysburg National Military Parks; Manassas National Battlefield Park; Badlands, Dinosaur, George Washington Birthplace, Joshua Tree, Petrified Forest, and Scotts Bluff National Monuments; and Big Bend parcel of land adjoining Big Bend National Park necessary to connect the park road system with State Highway No. 227, Glacier, Grand Canyon, Great Smoky Mountains, Kings Canyon, Lassen Volcanic, Mesa Verde, Mount Rainier, Olympic, Rocky Mountain, Sequoia, Yosemite, and Zion National Parks."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out lines 13 and 14 of said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(parcels of land adjoining Big Bend National Park necessary to connect the park road system with State Highway 227)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 211: Page 96, line 13, insert:

"California wildlife management areas: For the purchase or rent, and development, maintenance, and administration of wildlife management areas in the State of California, as authorized by the act of May 18, 1948 (Public Law 534), $300,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$250,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 212: Page 96, line 19, strike out "$9,226,979" and insert "$10,257,309."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$9,928,509."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 214: Page 97, line 16, strike out "$9,226,979" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,257,309."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 214, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$9,928,509."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. As the gentleman knows, I am very much interested in the development in the Missouri River Basin, particularly in the Republican Valley in Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado. In that area the Bureau of Reclamation is not only carrying on construction for irrigation, but for flood control also. I appeared before the gentleman's committee and also the Senate committee, urging the full budget amounts for these projects.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Nebraska has been most diligent, not only this year, but throughout the years that I have served on this committee. I am sure that everyone on that committee knows about the problems of the Republican Valley and we are interested in the early completion of Frenchman-Cambridge project, the Bostwick and all the rest of them.

Mr. CURTIS. The amounts carried in the conference report for these projects is an increase over what we started out with, but it is not yet quite up to the budget estimates.

Mr. JENSEN. May I say that the committee has gone over these figures very carefully? We have taken the testimony of the engineers as well as the Bureau of the Budget. We want these projects to go forward at an efficient and economical rate, and we believe that the figures finally agreed upon will do that.

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to have the assurance of the Chairman of the committee that this irrigation and flood control work will go on at an efficient rate.

Mr. JENSEN. We have taken into account the amount of money that the projects were able to use last year, and all the other factors, and if what has been done proves to be erroneous I can assure you that this committee will be willing to look into the matter when and if such a time comes. And may I say further to the gentleman from Nebraska that he has been most diligent in presenting the needs and wants of his district before this committee, and that because of his efficient work, more flood-control and irrigation projects are under construction in his district than perhaps in any other congressional district in the country?

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

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

Mr. BUCK. When this bill was passed by the House it contained adequate provision for the improvement and rehabilitation of Bedloe Island. May I ask the gentleman whether that provision is undisturbed in the conference report?

Mr. JENSEN. It was not disturbed. The $500,000 for the improvement and rehabilitation of Bedloe Island, on which the Statue of Liberty is located, is in the bill exactly as the House approved it and I am happy to state that the work will go forward and this disgraceful situation which has existed for the past 16 years or longer will be taken care of in the proper manner. I want to thank the gentleman from New York for the great interest he has taken in that great symbol of our freedom.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman for his helpfulness in this matter.

As chairman of the subcommittee charged with the National Park Service appropriation, the able gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], recognized the need for correcting the disgraceful conditions which have prevailed on Bedloe Island for years, and which have sullied the Statue of Liberty. He felt that this shrine of Americanism merits surroundings of beauty, rather than ugly decrepitude. He therefore included in the bill a sum sufficient for a proper job of rehabilitation, and was diligent in protecting that sum against any attempt at deletion.

All patriotic Americans are indebted to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for this fine accomplishment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I note a small increase in the appropriation for the Missouri River Basin program. Was that increase proportionately applied to the several projects phase A and phase B?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, generally speaking, they were.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I note also that in the report on the appropriation with reference to the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, it is referred to as the Standing Rock Indians of North Dakota. The Standing Rock Reservation is about equally in South Dakota and North Dakota. Is this $50,000 for the Standing Rock Indians of North Dakota, or does it apply to the entire reservation?

Mr. JENSEN. Apparently the amendment covers only those in North Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let us get that clear.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] handles the Indian problems of this committee. I wish the gentleman from Oklahoma would comment on that.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. In reference to this particular item I do not think there was ever any question but what the item was taken as it was presented to us.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I suggest that the agency headquarters happens to be across the line in North Dakota, but the reservation is almost equally in both States.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. My understanding is it applies to all of the interested parties, regardless of their status of residence.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To the Standing Rock Reservation?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Rather than to the North Dakota members.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is right.

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

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

Mr. HAGEN. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the new Alaska Indian Service sanatorium and hospital for the care of the tuberculous will be located in southwestern Alaska?

Mr. JENSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HAGEN. Further, may I ask the gentleman this question: During the hearings I appeared before the committee and urged that the hospital be located in the Matanuska Valley at or near Palmer. The chairman of the subcommittee has been there and I should like to ask him if he does not agree that Palmer would be a very suitable location for this hospital.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it would be a very suitable location. However, of course, it is not up to this committee to designate the placing of the hospital, but it is a very beautiful valley and I think it would be a good place for the hospital if the authorities felt so inclined. I certainly would be glad to see it at Palmer.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include an editorial appearing in the Anchorage Daily News.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. There has been some discussion of locating the sanatorium at Anchorage as well as Palmer. I should like to suggest that because of the great concentration of Government work and development at Anchorage, the housing shortage is constantly becoming more acute, and the labor supply is short. Palmer in the Matanuska Valley is less than 50 miles from Anchorage and if the sanatorium were located in that vicinity, there would be convenient access to Anchorage. Furthermore there are many important advantages of having the institution located in the Palmer area. As we all know, the Matanuska Valley is the center of the largest farming community in Alaska which means the sanatorium would be conveniently located with reference to farm produce.

Construction of a great new airport will probably start at Anchorage this year, there will be considerable road work, the Army will continue its activities, and thus it would seem it would be the sensible thing to construct the tuberculosis sanatorium elsewhere where the competition for living quarters, workmen, and so forth would not be so great.

I should like to insert an editorial from the Anchorage Daily News dated Wednesday, May 26, 1948.

THE OBVIOUS PLACE

Ever since the Joint Appropriations Subcommittee began its deliberations on a bill calling for the building of a 400-bed hospital in Alaska, as the first step in a move designed to alleviate the growing incidence of tuberculosis among the native Indians, there has been a great deal of pressure exerted to bring the hospital to Anchorage.

With the bill due to be reported out of committee on Thursday there seems to be a growing fervor to bring more pressure to bear for its location here. Normally we would be inclined to feel the erection of such an institution in the nearby Anchorage area, a sound proposition for the city.

However, we feel there are several points which should be given full consideration before exerting pressure for its construction here. We realize the cost of the structure will total some $5,000,000 and that the annual pay roll will amount to approximately $1,000,000, but one of the biggest hurdles for this area would be to find the necessary land that would meet the requirements of the Office of Indian Affairs who will administer the activities of the hospital.

In the meantime Palmer residents have been spurred on by their interest in the project to the extent that several tracts of land have been offered free to the Government. Needless to say, the Government will not bypass such an offer if the various tracts made available meet their needs.

It seems to us that Palmer offers other advantages which Anchorage cannot meet, such as the nearby availability of garden fresh foodstuffs which are required in the treatment of tubercular patients. Important, too, is the fact that such an institution would provide part time work for many of the homesteaders in the Matanuska Valley.

And there can be no doubt but that Anchorage would also profit in the long run, as much of the funds needed to run the hospital would ultimately be spent here, as would salaries.

But more important than just the bringing of more money to Anchorage is the long-range view—the necessity for development of the territory as a whole. If Alaska is to prosper, it will never occur if Juneau, Fairbanks, and Anchorage keep running to the pot with a gravy spoon.

We say, let's help Palmer get the hospital.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. How much is contained in this bill for the construction of the Natchez Trace?

Mr. JENSEN. We have a contract authorization of $2,680,000 which the conferees will recommend for parkways. There is no cash in this bill earmarked for that particular parkway. The Park Service has in excess of a $5,000,000 carry-over. We are also recommending a contract authorization in the amount of $2,680,000. So, they have sufficient funds, I am sure, to take care of most of the needed construction on parkways.

Mr. RANKIN. They ought to begin to use it. These parkways ought not to just be used to furnish jobs for individuals. They ought to go ahead and do this work.

Mr. JENSEN. We certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I shall insist on it from now on.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, it is rather apparent that a lot of pushing has not been done because of the great carry-over they have. But, they promised us they would go forward and get this work done. That, of course, is an administrative function of the Department.

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

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

Mr. BARRETT. I note here that the Senate has decreased the amount for the construction of roads and trails in the national parks.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will permit, that all applies to Alaska; not to the mainland.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. I note here that the Senate has stricken out the language with reference to regional offices as written in, in the House for the Bureau of Land Management, and I note this language in the conference report:

> That none of the appropriations made in this act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel assigned to regional offices of the Bureau of Land Management in excess of the average total number of all personnel assigned to such regional offices during the fiscal year 1948; and the Senate agree to the same.

Will the gentleman explain that language to me?

Mr. JENSEN. The purpose of that amendment is to keep the Department from expanding other than in district offices where the tract books are supposed to be, so that we can get these thousands of leases adjudicated, some of which may be from two and a half to six years old. I might say to the gentleman that the job of the Bureau of Land Management is now the baby of the Congressmen from the West who objected to getting this thing straightened out according to the House version so that we could get these leases adjudicated. But, they seem to think that they should have the say, and so it is now their baby. If we do not get these leases expedited, they will know exactly who is going to be held responsible.

Mr. BARRETT. This amendment will not prohibit automatic increases in pay for these people?

Mr. JENSEN. No.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. D'EWART. The chairman will remember our colloquy with regard to the Lower Marias and the Montana pumping. I gather that part of the funds for these two projects are in the conference report carried up to phase A.

Mr. JENSEN. $450,000 of the Lower Marias was carried up to phase A, but the Montana pumping has not been changed from phase B to phase A. It is still in phase B.

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

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

Mr. MURDOCK. The House put in a provision which I greatly question. What became of the amendment that provided that the Commissioner of Reclamation must be an engineer?

Mr. JENSEN. The House agreed to the Senate version of that provision.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Under the appropriation to carry out the Bureau of Mines program in regard to synthetic fuels, the budget requested how much, and how much was finally allowed in this appropriation?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] will answer that. He is in charge of the mines and mining section of this bill.

Mr. FENTON. In the conference the Bureau of Mines got every nickel they asked for.

Mr. DURHAM. That is good.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 724)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 75, enabling the United States to render financial, technical, and material aid to the Governments of Greece and Turkey, I submit herewith the third quarterly report on the activities and expenditures of funds under the authority of this act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 18, 1948.

INCREASING THE RATES OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH COMPENSATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, 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. 2825) to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected, 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 with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: That paragraph IV of part I of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided in part I, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

"'Widow but no child, $75; widow with one child, $100 (with $15 each additional child); no widow but one child, $58; no widow but two children, $82 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $106 (equally divided) (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $60 (or both), $35 each.'

"SEC. 2. Subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Any veteran or the dependents of any deceased veteran otherwise entitled to compensation under the provisions of part II of this regulation or the general pension law shall be entitled to receive the rate of compensation provided in part I of this regulation, if the disability or death of such veteran resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, or (2) while engaged in extra hazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) while the United States is engaged in war.'

"SEC. 3. Paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided for in part II, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at 80 per centum of the rates specified for such dependents in paragraph IV, part I hereof, as now or hereafter amended.'

"SEC. 4. The increases provided by this Act shall be effective from the first day of the second month following the passage of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH BUTLER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The substantial differences in rates between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following schedule:

	Existing law	H. R. 3748	S. 2825	Conference agreement
Widow but no child	$60.00	$75	$70	$75.
Widow with 1 child	78.00	115	94	$100 (with $15 for each additional child).
Widow with 2 children	93.60	135	112	
Widow with 3 children	109.20	155	127	
Widow with 4 children	124.80	175	142	
Widow with 5 children	140.40	195	157	
No widow but 1 child	30.00	50	58	$58.
No widow but 2 children	45.60	70	82	$82 (equally divided).
No widow but 3 children	57.60	90	106	$106 (equally divided) (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided).
No widow but 4 children	69.60	110	126	
No widow but 5 children	81.60	130	146	
Dependent mother or father	54.00	75	54	$60.
Dependent mother and father, each	30.00	40	30	$35.

The House bill placed an annual income limitation to $1,800 for one parent or $3,000 for two for use in determining dependency. It also excluded life-insurance payments from any source in an amount less than $3,000 received in any one year. The conference agreement eliminates this provision. It was pointed out that complaints were made that the criteria in the Veterans' Administration regulations for determining dependency of parents were not liberal enough to meet present-day requirements. Accordingly, the conferees agreed that the Veterans' Administration should survey such regulations with a view toward revision to meet current needs.

The Senate bill provided that widows and orphans of peacetime veterans should receive 80 percent of the rates specified for wartime cases. No provision of this character was contained in the House bill. The House managers agreed to accept it.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 2825, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The conferees on S. 2825, providing increases for widows and dependents of veterans who lost their lives in the service of their country have reached, in my opinion, a reasonable compromise.

The rates for widow but no child, $75; widow with one child, $100—with $15 for each additional child; no widow but one child, $58; no widow but two children, $82—equally divided; no widow but three children, $106—equally divided (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $60, or both, $35 each.

These figures mean a slight increase over the House bill rates for orphans and a slight increase for widows and widows with one or more children over the Senate bill rates.

The House managers have agreed to accept the Senate amendment providing 80 percent of wartime compensation for widows and dependents of peacetime veterans.

The House receded from its section providing an increase of income limitation for parents. However, the conferees agreed that the present Veterans' Administration formula is antiquated and in serious need of revision. It was agreed that unless the Veterans' Administration revised their formula to fit existing economic conditions, legislation to accomplish this purpose would be enacted in the next session of the Congress.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, 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 with an amendment as follows: "That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 per centum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $21;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $35;

"(c) has a wife and two children living, $45.50;

"(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $56;

"(e) has no wife but one child living, $14;

"(f) has no wife but two children living, $24.50;

"(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $35;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $17.50 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 per centum, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

"SEC. 2. That any person entitled to compensation at peacetime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in paragraph I, part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, except paragraph I (c) thereof, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 per centum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $16.80;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $28;

"(c) has a wife and two children living, $36.40;

"(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $44.80;

"(e) has no wife but one child living, $11.20;

"(f) has no wife but two children living, $19.60;

"(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $28;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $14 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 per centum, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

"SEC. 3. The additional compensation for a dependent or dependents provided by this Act shall not be payable to any veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of compensation or of subsistence allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That he may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

"SEC. 4. The administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulations thereunder, as amended, shall be for application under this Act.

"SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment."

And the House agree to the same.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH BUTLER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The substantial differences in rates between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following schedule:

Totally disabled	H. R. 5588	S. 2821, wartime	S. 2821, peacetime	Conference agreement	
				Wartime	Peacetime
Wife, but no child	$30	$15.00	$12	$21.00	$16.80
Wife, 1 child	50	25.00	20	35.00	28.00
Wife, 2 children	65	32.50	26	45.50	36.40
Wife, 3 or more children	80	40.00	32	56.00	44.80
No wife, 1 child	20	10.00	8	14.00	11.20
No wife, 2 children	35	17.50	14	24.50	19.60
No wife, 3 or more children	50	25.00	20	35.00	28.00
Dependent parent or parents, each	25	12.50	10	17.50	14.00

The conference agreement also provides that if and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 percent, the amount of additional compensation shall be in an amount having the same ratio to the amount specified in the above schedule under heading of "Conference agreement" as the degree of disability bears to the total disability.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 2821, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The conferees agreed on 70 percent of the House rates on this bill which would increase the compensation received by veterans who are 60 percent or more disabled and who have one or more dependents.

The House accepted the Senate provision providing for 80 percent of wartime rates for peacetime veterans—a provision which was not included in the original House bill.

I think we have reached a reasonable compromise and the best that could be done under existing conditions. I move the adoption of the conference report.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is in control of the time. Does the gentlewoman yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agreed not to take any time in order to have the bill come up promptly and be sent to the other body. So I have not yielded any time.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has control of the time.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, our first duty is to the disabled veterans.

You have heard a good deal of demagoguery about my attitude on the Negro question. I got through the committee a bill to establish a Negro veterans' hospital in Virginia because the real Negroes wanted it. It would give them an opportunity to supply their own doctors and nurses and to show what they can do. This outfit which calls itself the Association for the Advancement of the Colored Race has interfered with it in the other body, although it passed the House without opposition.

The one Negro in America whose name stands out as a representative of his race is Booker T. Washington. I am going to read you a telegram I received from his daughter this morning about this hospital. The telegram is from New York. It is as follows:

Hon. JOHN RANKIN,
Washington, D. C.:

This is to express my deep appreciation to you for your tireless efforts in trying to get a veterans' hospital at my father's birthplace for our people. I am praying that you might yet find a way for this bill to get through the Senate, since it has passed the House.

PORTIA WASHINGTON PITTMAN.

That is Booker T. Washington's daughter. They want this hospital, and the white people of the South want them to have it.

It will furnish them an institution where they can be to themselves, where they can have their own doctors and their own nurses. We have one such hospital at Tuskegee, Ala. I was chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation for 16 years, and I saw to it that they got what they needed. They have done a good job. We have one established in Mound Bayou, Miss., for the same purpose.

These Negroes came here asking for this one in Virginia, and the House voted unanimously for it.

Yet it is being held up in the Senate because of the pressure being used by an outfit, that I regard as a Communist-front outfit, that is doing infinite harm to the Negroes of this country.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I heartily agree with the gentleman that the colored doctors have done a remarkable job, as well as the colored nurses.

Mr. RANKIN. The passage of this bill would be to the best interest of both the Negro veterans and the white veterans in Virginia and adjoining States. It passed the House unanimously, and I feel sure it would pass the Senate unanimously, if the Members of that body are permitted to vote on it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 3 OF THE STANDARD TIME ACT OF 1918

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 6318, an act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out all after *"Provided"*, over to and including "time" in line 4, page 2, and insert: "That common carriers within such portion of the State of Idaho may conduct their operations on Pacific time."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERSTATE BOUNDARY COMPACT BY AND BETWEEN THE STATES OF MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, AND WISCONSIN

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 206 consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

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

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the following interstate boundary compact by and between the State of Michigan, the State of Minnesota, and the State of Wisconsin:

A COMPACT

Entered into by and between the State of Michigan, the State of Minnesota, and the State of Wisconsin, States signatory hereto.

The contracting States solemnly agree:

1. That the boundary between the State of Michigan and the State of Wisconsin in the center of Lake Michigan be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked A-B-C-D-E-F-G on the map, exhibit A, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

Starting at point A, a point equidistant from either shore on the line which is the eastward continuation of the boundary line between Wisconsin and Illinois or latitude 42°29'37" north;

Thence to point B, a point equidistant from either shore on the line drawn through the Port Washington fog signal and storm signal and the White Lake storm signal, on a true azimuth of 354°12'00", a distance of 61.55 statute miles;

Thence to point C, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Sheboygan Coast Guard storm signal, fog signal, radio beacon, and Little Stable Point Light, on a true azimuth of 03°01'15", a distance of 22.18 statute miles;

Thence to point D, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Twin River Point Light and fog signal and Big Sable fog and light signal, on a true azimuth of 10°04'30", a distance of 30.33 statute miles;

Thence to point E, a point equidistant from either shore on a line from Baileys Harbor inland light and Point Betsie fog signal, radio beacon, and distance finding station, on a true azimuth of 17°09'55", a distance of 54.20 statute miles;

Thence to point F, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Pilot Island Light and fog signal and Sleeping Bear Point Light, on a true azimuth of 33°29'10", a distance of 17.24 statute miles;

Thence to point G, the point determined by the United States Supreme Court decree of March 12, 1936, which is a point 45,600 meters from the center of Rock Island Passage on a bearing of south 60° east, on a true azimuth of 49°34'10", a distance of 15.66 statute miles.

The latitude and longitude of the named control points are as follows:

Point A—Latitude 42°29'37"
Longitude 87°01'15"
Point B—Latitude 43°22'50"
Longitude 87°08'50"
Point C—Latitude 43°42'00"
Longitude 87°07'20"
Point D—Latitude 44°07'55"
Longitude 87°00'45"
Point E—Latitude 44°52'50"
Longitude 86°41'10"
Point F—Latitude 45°05'20"
Longitude 86°29'30"
Point G—Latitude 45°14'10"
Longitude 86°14'55"

2. That the western boundary of the State of Michigan in the waters of Lake Superior and the eastern boundary in the waters of Lake Superior of the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked M-N on the map, exhibit B, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

Starting at point M, the point where the line through the middle of the main channel of the Montreal River enters Lake Superior,

Thence in a direct line to point N, the point where a line drawn through the most easterly point of Pigeon Point and the most southerly point of Pine Point intersects the international boundary, on a true azimuth of 23°27'24" and a distance of 108.86 statute miles.

The latitude and longitude of the named control points is:

Point M—Latitude 46°34'05"
Longitude 90°25'05"
Point N—Latitude 48°00'50"
Longitude 89°29'00"

3. That the boundary between the State of Minnesota and the State of Wisconsin in the center of Lake Superior be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked A-B-C-D on the map, exhibit B, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

Starting at point A which is the midpoint on the line M-N described in paragraph 2, supra;

Thence to point B, the midpoint in a direct line between the mouth of Cross River, Minn., and the lighthouse on Outer Island in Wisconsin, on a true azimuth of 272°17'10", a distance of 33.15 statute miles;

Thence to point C, the midpoint in a direct line between the lighthouse on shore at Two Harbors, Minn., and the light on the lakeward end of the Government east pier at Port Wing, Wis., on a true azimuth of 235°27'40", a distance of 49.60 statute miles;

Thence to point D, the midpoint in a direct line at right angles to the central axis of the Superior entry between the tops of the eastern ends of the pierheads at the lakeward ends of the United States Government breakwaters at the Superior entry to Duluth Superior Harbor, on a true azimuth of 239°50'20", a distance of 26.43 statute miles.

The latitude and longitude of the named control points are as follows:

Point A—Latitude 47°17'20"
Longitude 89°57'00"
Point B—Latitude 47°18'35"
Longitude 90°39'15"
Point C—Latitude 46°54'10"
Longitude 91°31'25"
Point D—Latitude 46°42'39.875"
Longitude 92°00'24.571"

4. All azimuths are measured clockwise from true north.

5. That this compact shall become operative immediately upon its ratification by any State as between it and the other State or States so ratifying. Ratification shall be made by act of the legislature of the ratifying State.

6. That immediately upon ratification of this compact by all three States, each State will appoint two members to a Joint Survey Commission to survey and mark the boundaries defined in this compact by establishing and perpetuating monuments at the reference points on shore by means of which the control points of said boundaries are located. The expense of marking the Lake Michigan boundary shall be borne jointly by the States of Michigan and Wisconsin; the expense of marking the boundary line described in paragraph 2 above shall be borne equally by the States of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin. The expense of marking the Lake Superior boundary between Minnesota and Wisconsin shall be borne jointly by the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

In witness whereof:

I, Kim Sigler, Governor of the State of Michigan, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Governor, and pursuant to the provisions of Act No. 267, of the Public Acts of 1947, approved June 27, 1947, which ratifies paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 of the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Michigan and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Michigan.

Done at the city of Lansing, in the State of Michigan, this 3d day of February, in the year of our Lord, 1948.

[SEAL] (S) KIM SIGLER,
Governor.
(S) F. W. ALGERE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

In witness whereof:

I, Luther W. Youngdahl, Governor of the State of Minnesota, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Governor and pursuant to the provisions of chapter 589, Laws of Minnesota for the year 1947, approved April 26, 1947, which ratifies the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Minnesota, and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Minnesota.

Done at the city of St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota, this 30th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1947.

[SEAL] (S) LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor.
(S) MIKE HOHN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

In witness whereof:

I, Oscar Rennebohm, Acting Governor of the State of Wisconsin, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Acting Governor, and pursuant to the provisions of chapter 222, Laws of Wisconsin for the year 1947, approved June 12, 1947, which ratifies the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Wisconsin and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Wisconsin.

Done at the city of Madison in the State of Wisconsin, this 22d day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1947.

[SEAL] (S) OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
Acting Governor.
(S) ROBERT C. ZIMMERMAN,
Assistant Secretary of State.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or in any manner affect any right of the United States.

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

DELEGATION OF CERTAIN POWERS BY CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD TO THE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4435, an act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 4, after "airspace", insert "immediately adjacent thereto and needed in connection therewith."

Page 3, line 11, after "Congress", insert ": *Provided*, That in the case of condemnations of easements through or other interests in airspace, in fixing condemnation awards, consideration may be given to the reasonable probable future use of the underlying land."

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman explain this amendment that has to do with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which makes changes which may affect our responsibility as far as appropriations are concerned.

Mr. HINSHAW. This bill was reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously and was passed by the House. I am sure it is satisfactory to the gentleman from Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. If there is to be much discussion about this, the request will have to be withdrawn.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has explained the amendment to me, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3566, an act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, 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 disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 5 of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the below quoted language appearing in lines 9 to 20:

"If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than ninety days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress passes a resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than ninety days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress does not pass such a resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law."

And insert in lieu thereof the below quoted language:

"If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress does not

pass such a concurrent resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

FRANK FELLOWS,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
EMANUEL CELLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H. R. 3566, to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the House bill strikes out all after the enacting clause and rewrites section 1 of the bill with amendment. The House agrees to the Senate amendment of section 1 of the bill providing for congressional review of the Attorney General's recommendations in deportation cases submitted to the Congress under section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 but insists on its amendment that the Congress shall have an opportunity to review these cases, not only in the session in whiel they are presented but also during the session next following, if so desired. To this amendment the managers on the part of the Senate agree.

The managers on the part of the House agree to the Senate amendment striking out section 2 of the bill.

FRANK FELLOWS,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
EMANUEL CELLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPLACED PERSONS BILL

Mr. FELLOWS submitted the following conference report on 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, for printing under the rule:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) entitled "An Act 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", 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 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That, this Act may be cited as the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

"SEC. 2. When used in this Act the term—

"(a) 'Commission' means the Displaced Persons Commission created pursuant to this Act;

"(b) 'Displaced person' means any displaced person or refugee as defined in Annex I of the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization and who is the concern of the International Refugee Organization.

"(c) 'Eligible displaced person' means a displaced person as defined in subsection (b) above, (1) who on or after September 1, 1939, and on or before December 22, 1945, entered Germany, Austria, or Italy and who on January 1, 1948, was in Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria; or a person who, having resided in Germany or Austria, was a victim of persecution by the Nazi government and was detained in, or was obliged to flee from such persecution and was subsequently returned to, one of these countries as a result of enemy action, or of war circumstances, and on January 1, 1948, had not been firmly resettled therein, and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence, and (3) for whom assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commission have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such person, and the members of such person's family who shall accompany such person and who propose to live with such person, shall not become public charges and will have safe and sanitary housing without displacing some other person from such housing. The spouse and unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age of such an eligible displaced person shall, if otherwise qualified for admission into the United States for permanent residence, also be deemed eligible displaced persons.

"(d) 'Eligible displaced person' shall also mean a native of Czechoslovakia who had fled as a direct result of persecution or fear of persecution from that country since January 1, 1948, and (1) who is on the effective date of this Act in Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria, and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence, and (3) for whom assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commission have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such person, and the members of such person's family who shall accompany such person and who propose to live with such person, shall not become public charges and will have safe and sanitary housing without displacing some other person from such housing. The spouse and unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age of such an eligible displaced person shall, if otherwise qualified for admission into the United States for permanent residence, also be deemed eligible displaced persons.

"(e) 'Eligible displaced orphan' means a displaced person (1) who is under the age of 16 years, and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence, and (3) who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of both parents, and (4) who, on or before the effective date of this Act, was in Italy or in the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna or the American zone, the British zone or the French zone of either Germany or Austria, and (5) for whom satisfactory assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commisison have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be cared for properly.

"SEC. 3. (a) During the two fiscal years following the passage of this Act a number of immigration visas not to exceed 202,000 may be issued without regard to quota limitations for those years to eligible displaced persons as quota immigrants, as provided in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That not less than 40 per centum of the visas issued pursuant to this Act shall be available exclusively to eligible displaced persons whose place of origin or country of nationality has been de facto annexed by a foreign power: *Provided further*, That not more than 2,000 visas shall be issued to eligible displaced persons as defined in subsection (d) of section 2 of this Act.

"(b) Upon the issuance of an immigration visa to any eligible displaced person as provided for in this Act, the consular officer shall use a quota number from the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the Act of May 26, 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 212), for the fiscal year then current at the time or, if no such quota number is available for said fiscal year, in that event for the first succeeding fiscal year in which a quota number is available: *Provided*, That not more than 50 per centum of any quota shall be so used in any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That eligible displaced orphans may be issued special nonquota immigration visas, except that the number of such special nonquota immigration visas shall not exceed three thousand.

"SEC. 4. (a) Any alien who (1) entered the United States prior to April 1, 1948, and (2) is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, and (3) is a displaced person residing in the United States as defined in this section may apply to the Attorney General for an adjustment of his immigration status. If the Attorney General shall, upon consideration of all the facts and circumstances of the case, determine that such alien is qualified under the provisions of this section, the Attorney General shall report to the Congress all of the pertinent facts in the case. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the end of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the granting of the status of permanent residence to such alien the Attorney General is authorized, upon receipt of a fee of $18.00, which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the account of miscellaneous receipts, to record the admission of the alien for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last entry into the United States. If prior to the end of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress does not pass such resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law: *Provided*, That the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to this section shall not exceed 15,000. Upon the grant of status of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this section, the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was a quota immigrant at the time of entry, reduce by one the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in Section 12 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, for the fiscal year then current or the next succeeding fiscal year in which a quota number is available, but not more than 50 per centum of any quota shall be used for this purpose in any given fiscal year: *Provided further*, That quota deductions provided for in this section shall be made within the 50 per centum limitations contained in section 3 (b) of this Act.

"(b) When used in this section the term 'Displaced Person residing in the United States' means a person who establishes that

he lawfully entered the United States as a non-immigrant under section 3 or as a non-quota immigrant student under subdivision (e) of Section 4 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended, and that he is a person displaced from the country of his birth, or nationality, or of his last residence as a result of events subsequent to the outbreak of World War II; and that he cannot return to any of such countries because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinions.

"SEC. 5. Quota nationality for the purposes of this Act shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 160–161; 8 U. S. C. 212) and no eligible displaced person shall be issued an immigration visa if he is known or believed by the consular officer to be subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws, with the exception of the contract labor clause of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875–878; 8 U. S. C. 136), and that part of the said Act which excludes from the United States persons whose ticket or passage is paid by another or by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, either directly or indirectly; and all eligible displaced persons and eligible displaced orphans shall be exempt from paying visa fees and head taxes.

"SEC. 6. The preferences provided within the quotas by Section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 155–156; 47 Stat. 656; 45 Stat. 1009; 8 U. S. C. 206), shall not be applicable in the case of any eligible displaced person receiving an immigration visa under this Act, but in lieu of such preferences the following preferences, without priority in time of issuance of visas as between such preferences, shall be granted to eligible displaced persons and their family dependents who are the spouse or the unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age, in the consideration of visa applications:

"(a) First. Eligible displaced persons who have been previously engaged in agricultural pursuits and who will be employed in the United States in agricultural pursuits: *Provided*, That not less than 30 per centum of the visas issued pursuant to this Act shall be made available exclusively to such persons: *And provided further*, That the wife, and unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age, of such persons may, in accordance with the regulations of the Commission, be deemed to be of that class of persons who have been previously engaged in agricultural pursuits and who will be employed in the United States in agricultural pursuits.

"(b) Second. Eligible displaced persons who are household construction, clothing, and garment workers, and other workers needed in the locality in the United States in which such persons propose to reside; or eligible displaced persons possessing special educational, scientific, technological or professional qualifications.

"(c) Third. Eligible displaced persons who are the blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted alien residents of the United States, such relationship in either case being within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law.

"SEC. 7. Within the preferences provided in section 6, priority in the issuance of visas shall be given first to eligible displaced persons who during World War II bore arms against the enemies of the United States and are unable or unwilling to return to the countries of which they are nationals because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinions and second, to eligible displaced persons who, on January 1, 1948, were located in displaced persons camps and centers, but in exceptional cases visas may be issued to those eligible displaced persons located outside of displaced persons camps and centers upon a showing, in accordance with the regulations of the Commission, of special circumstances which would justify such issuance.

"SEC. 8. There is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Displaced Persons Commission, consisting of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term ending June 30, 1951, and one member of the Commission shall be designated by him as chairman. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 per annum. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to enable the Commission to discharge its duties. Within the limits of such funds as may be appropriated to the Commission or as may be allocated to it by the President, the Commission may employ necessary personnel without regard to the Civil Service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make provisions for necessary supplies, facilities, and services to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this Act. It shall be the duty of the Commission to formulate and issue regulations, necessary under the provisions of this Act, and in compliance therewith, for the admission into the United States of eligible displaced orphans and eligible displaced persons. The Commission shall formulate and issue regulations for the purpose of obtaining the most general distribution and settlement of persons admitted under this Act throughout the United States and their Territories and possessions. It shall also be the duty of the Commission to report on February 1, 1949, and semiannually thereafter to the President and to the Congress on the situation regarding eligible displaced orphans, eligible displaced persons and displaced persons. Such report shall also include information respecting employment conditions and the housing situation in this country, the place and type of employment, and the residence of eligible displaced orphans and eligible displaced persons who have been admitted into the United States pursuant to the provisions of this Act. At the end of its term the Commission shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress.

"SEC. 9. Every eligible displaced person, except an eligible displaced person who shall have derived his status because of being the spouse or an unmarried dependent child under twenty-one years of age of an eligible displaced person, who shall be admitted into the United States shall report, on the 1st day of January and on the 1st day of July of each year until he shall have made four reports to the Commission, respecting the employment, place of employment, and residence of such person and the members of such person's family and shall furnish such other information in connection with said employment and residence as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe: *Provided*, That if such person enters the United States within 60 days prior to either the 1st day of January or the 1st day of July, the first report need not be made until the next date on which a report is required to be made. Such report shall be made to the Commission during its term and thereafter to the Attorney General. Any person who willfully violates the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not to exceed $500, or be imprisoned not more than 6 months.

"SEC. 10. 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. Any person who shall willfully make a misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as an eligible displaced person shall thereafter not be admissible into the United States. No eligible displaced orphan or eligible displaced person shall be admitted into the United States under the provisions of this Act except in pursuance of the regulations of the Commission, but, except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, the administration of this Act, under the provisions of this Act and the regulations of the Commission as herein provided, shall be by the officials who administer the other immigration laws of the United States. Except as otherwise authorized in this Act, all immigration laws, including deportation laws, shall be applicable to eligible displaced orphans and eligible displaced persons who apply to be or who are admitted into the United States pursuant to this Act.

"SEC. 11. After June 30, 1948, no preference or priority shall be given to any person because of his status as a displaced person, or his status as an eligible displaced person, in the issuance of visas under the other immigration laws of the United States.

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to immediately resume general consular activities in Germany and Austria to the end that the German and Austrian quotas shall be available for applicants for immigration visas pursuant to the immigration laws. From and after June 30, 1948, and until July 1, 1950, notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended, 50 per centum of the German and Austrian quotas shall be available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, or Yugoslavia and who, on the effective date of this Act reside in Germany and Austria.

"SEC. 13. No visas shall be issued under the provisions of this Act to any person who is or has been a member of, or participated in, any movement which is or has been hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States.

"SEC. 14. Any person or persons who knowingly violate or conspire to violate any provision of this Act, except section 9, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000, or shall be imprisoned not less than two or more than ten years, or both."

And the House agree to the same.

FRANK FELLOWS,
E. WALLACE CHADWICK,
ED GOSSETT,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
FRANK L. CHELF,
Managers on the Part of the House.
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
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 amendment of the House 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, submit the following statement in explanation to the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

In a free exchange of opinions and arguments the conferees endeavored to compose the numerous differences of the measures passed by their respective Houses.

The compromise bill would admit into the United States for permanent residence up to a maximum of 220,000 displaced persons, and it is the confident expectation of the conferees that the enactment of this legislation will be regarded by other countries and particu-

larly by the members of the International Refugee Organization as an inducement to further recognition of their obligations to accept a relative share of the displaced persons. This legislation has proceeded upon the assumption that other nations will soon accept for resettlement a proportionate number of displaced persons, and that by doing so they will cooperate with the United States in expediting the closing of the camps and terminating the emergency.

It is further the consensus of the conferees that the language of the proviso to section 3 (a) of the bill providing for a special priority for displaced persons "whose place of origin or country of nationality has been de facto annexed by a foreign power" has been used exclusively for the purpose of the definition of a certain class of eligible displaced persons and that it cannot and shall not be understood or interpreted as implying any recognition on behalf of the Government of the United States of the territorial status in eastern Europe.

The main differences between the House amendments and the bill as agreed to in conference are noted below, except for changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and clarifying changes made in order to perfect the legislation.

The "cut-off" date of December 22, 1945, for certain of the displaced persons has been agreed upon as representing the concept that persons displaced from their countries of origin during the war should be offered now immediately resettlement opportunities.

The consent of the Senate conferees has been obtained for the 15,000 displaced persons residing in the United States to be offered the opportunity to obtain the status of permanent residents subject to final approval by the Congress of recommendations made in that respect by the Attorney General.

The special preference accorded to persons engaged in agricultural pursuits is prompted by the desire for general basic distribution of persons admitted pursuant to the bill and also because the housing situation is much less acute in the rural areas.

The special preference granted under section 3 (a) is prompted by the fact that nationals of countries and provinces made de facto parts of the U. S. S. R. represents the real "hard core" of the displaced persons in view of the fact that their repatriation is highly improbable because of the political situation prevailing in their countries and places of origin.

The Senate conferees agreed to two House amendments (*a*) admitting up to 2,000 recent refugees from Czechoslovakia provided that they are at the date of the enactment of the bill in the zones specified therein, and (*b*) admitting nonquota up to 3,000 eligible displaced orphans provided that satisfactory assurances have been given that such orphans if admitted into the United States will be cared for properly.

The Senate conferees have also agreed to those sections of the House amendment which provide that all visas issued under the bill, except visas issued for eligible displaced orphans, should be properly charged to quotas, as established by the existing law.

The House conferees have agreed to an amended version of a section of the Senate bill which would make 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas available from and after June 30, 1948, and until July 1, 1950, for persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Yugoslavia.

The various differences between the measures passed by both Houses pertaining to the administration of the bill were composed so as to insure the proper enforcement of the law, a suitable resettlement of displaced persons all over the United States, its Territories and possessions, and by preserving all safeguards with respect to exclusion of subversives and by providing for proper assurances that new immigrants shall not become public charges.

The managers on the part of the House believe that this is the best displaced persons bill upon which the conferees could agree and that if any legislation upon this subject is to be enacted, it is incumbent upon the House to give its approval to the compromise bill as reported.

FRANK FELLOWS,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
E. WALLACE CHADWICK,
FRANK L. CHELF,
ED GOSSETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. I wish an opportunity to speak briefly on the conference report. Also the gentleman from Maine desires to speak on the conference report. Will I have the right to do so without making a reservation of objection?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will have 1 hour on the conference report which he may yield. The Chair expresses the hope, however, that he will not be too liberal in his yielding.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not, nor will I take up any time of the House, but I am asking that the gentleman from Maine will explain whether or not the amendment I placed in the bill with reference to bringing Czechs into the United States is still in the bill.

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The conference report is not much longer than the statement. The Clerk will read the conference report.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Will I be deprived of making a motion to recommit the conference report—not desiring to take up any time—if I consent to the reading of the statement in lieu of the report?

The SPEAKER. That motion will be in order after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is rather late for anyone to criticize the displaced persons bill or the final conference report. To attempt amendments now or to refuse its acceptance would mean the death of the bill and all that it seeks to accomplish for the relief of the hopeless people who yearn for the day when at least some among them will be saved.

The bill should have been more liberal according to my viewpoint, but the rule of the majority decreed against expansion of its provisions and said it should be confined within rigid limits. I accept the dictum of the House and now accept the conference report. I believe the displaced persons' bill will prove itself so that we might expect Federal relief later. Meantime more than 200,000 unfortunates, including 3,000 orphans, 2,000 refugee Czechs, and others will be permitted to come to our shores. I regret more than I can ever say, how much I deplore the injection or the consideration of religious bias or intolerance in connection with such a bill. Such references have no basis in our American legislative system. I deplore it and abjure any contact with it. My only hope is that this bill, after having served a good purpose, will lead to further and final relief of the distressed.

The report has weaknesses not to be condoned, but its total virtues outweigh its gross deficiencies.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

(The Clerk began reading the conference report.)

Mr. MICHENER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understood, there was no objection to reading the statement in lieu of the report. The report is technical and just consumes time on a matter that is difficult to understand.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he did not put the request.

Mr. MICHENER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the technical report be dispensed with and that the statement be read in lieu thereof.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls for the regular order. It will either be the reading of the full report or the statement. The Chair is not depriving any one of his opportunity later to find out what is in the bill or to get time from the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is what I want to find out, whether or not we are going to have time for somebody to explain the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will have 1 hour. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has had a long, hard road; the hills have been steep and difficult to climb. Your committee has met and after several days has agreed. Except for two of our conferees we have signed the report.

I am not going to discuss the House bill. You are all familiar with that. I will discuss very briefly the salient features of the conference report.

The number, for example, is the same except for a ceiling of 3,000 orphans. So I can say that the number, 220,000, has been accepted.

The bill as reported by the Senate contained a provision that 50 percent of the 200,000 should be farmers. We have agreed upon 30 percent. You know, I come from a State where they trade sometimes.

In the bill reported by the Senate was a provision that 50 percent of the 200,000 should come from east of the Curzon Line, namely, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Eastern Poland. That has been reduced to 40 percent.

A provision that 15,000 be charged to the quota of those people who are in this country and have no place to go, has been accepted provided the House and Senate concur in the Attorney General's finding after his investigation, which is the same provision as will be found in 3566, the conference report on which has just been accepted.

The 2,000 Czechs, which were covered by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], have been accepted.

The ceiling on the orphans has been put at 3,000. According to the best figures available there are 3,000 orphans. In the House bill there was no limit on age. We agreed to 16 years in this report.

In this conference report also will be found the provision which appeared in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN], providing that certain men and women of German ethnic origin who had to flee to Germany after the Potsdam agreement may be allowed to come to this country by having assigned to them 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas over a 2-year period, if they qualify under all the immigration laws. This has nothing to do with the displaced person problem, as such. It is an amendment to the immigration law, permitting, to the extent indicated, the quota charge against Germany and Austria rather than their land of national origin.

It has nothing to do with the 200,000, however. It does give some relief to these people for a 2-year period only.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel that some difficulties will be encountered in view of the fact that the International Refugee Organization Charter specifically excepts those people from consideration as displaced persons?

Mr. FELLOWS. Does the gentleman mean without that?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. FELLOWS. I think so. I think we will have further trouble along the line. So we have accepted that provision, and that provision was offered, I think, by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

The real bone of contention is this date December 22, 1945. The House bill had the cut-off date of April 21, 1947. We felt that that was a fairer date, taking into consideration all of the circumstances. But we could not and have not changed the date of December 22, 1945, the effect of which is this: That the people who fled Poland after 1945—the exodus beginning somewhere in July 1946—will not be considered when they come to choose or applications are made for those people who are coming in under this so-called DP bill. We figure it is a matter of some 100,000.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, while I voted against this bill, I think this is the best that anyone could devise. There is no abler or finer man in this House than the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] and I think we should adopt this conference report.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. As one who served with the chairman all during this proceeding, from the day we began the hearings on the 4th day of June 1947, on the so-called Stratton bill, down to the close of the conference last night, I want to say this in justice to our chairman that no one has been more tolerant or more willing to hear all of the facts or has rendered more able assistance than has the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS]. In my judgment, no man could have done better. My own opinion is that this is a much better bill than the so-called Stratton bill. I do not think it is as good a bill as we had prepared in the House. But we either had to take the report that we did take or lose everything. Having spent the months that we did on this matter, I signed the report in the honest belief that we were doing the best thing for all the people of this country and for the people in the displaced-persons camps.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I say in relation to him that we would not be here today with this report or any bill whatsoever were it not for the efforts and the ability of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I also want to say that I think that this particular piece of legislation will be marked as one of the constructive pieces of legislation coming from this Congress. May I ask the gentleman also whether or not he was able to keep in the bill the inclusion of miners as one of the labor categories that would be recognized?

Mr. FELLOWS. I am very sorry. We did, however, agree on this: The word "miners" was stricken out, and then with the help of men like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], and two or three others, we were able to incorporate the words, after the divisions were set up, section 6 (b), providing for eligible displaced persons, "household, construction, clothing and garment workers and other workers needed in the locality of the United States in which such person proposes to settle." That is the best we could do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That, it seems to me, would embrace miners.

Mr. FELLOWS. I think so, too. That was our idea of it.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. As the gentleman knows, I have been exceedingly interested in this whole problem for some time, and I want to join my colleagues from Pennsylvania in paying a very high tribute to the statesmanlike quality exhibited by the gentleman from Maine in his handling of the bill. The conference report does not do everything that we would have liked, but I believe it is a fine piece of work even as it stands, and I shall support the conference report.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman. I signed this report. Without this there would be no legislation, and legislation is needed. Under this bill, although it does not perhaps satisfy everybody—it does not satisfy me—we are going to receive into this country some 220,000 of these people which will, I think, solve the question of the displaced-persons camps, will rid Europe of this cancer, and at the same time help us rehabilitate Germany.

I do not like a lot of it, and I can see that many people would disagree. It is much more restrictive than the so-called Fellows bill, because it provides, to start with, for 30 percent farmers. It also provides that 40 percent must come from east of this line. Among the 30 percent farmers will be included their wives and children. This is the best solution we could get, and in my judgment it is not wholly unfair, although I would prefer the date of April 21, 1947.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Without any criticism of the gentleman, because I think he tried very hard and really did a splendid job, and that there is any bill at all I think is attributable to the gentleman from Maine, is it not a fact that there still remains in this conference report the mortgaging of the quotas to the extent of 50 percent?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. If that is so, have we not taken the worst features of the Senate bill and the most onerous features of the House bill and put them together

and brought in this conference report? I say that without any criticism, because, as I said before, the gentleman from Maine has moved heaven and earth and has done a terrific job.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman for the compliment, but my answer would be that that is largely a point of view, of course. Much of this I would have preferred to eliminate if I could have done it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am very much interested in the statement the gentleman is making. I hope he takes enough time to make his statement complete, because this is a big proposition. As I understood the gentleman's statement with reference to the farmers, the conference report provides that 30 percent of the 20,000 shall be farmers.

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman also said something about the farmers' families.

Mr. FELLOWS. Of course, the wife of the farmer is going to be catalogued as a farmer, and I suppose his son is also. They will come within the 30 percent.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes. I presume all those above the quota age will be counted in the quota?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The children naturally would come in without being considered in the quota?

Mr. FELLOWS. I think they are all charged to the quota.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Maine and the members of his committee for preserving in the bill my amendment which permits 2,000 Czechs to come into this country. I have looked over the conference report on the Senate side and I know that you had a tremendous task to perform in order to bring out the best bill that could possibly be brought out. I compliment the gentleman and the members of his committee, and again express my deep appreciation for the preservation of the amendment I had in the bill.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. I congratulate the chairman on the work he has done, and appreciate the fine attitude evidenced by the gentleman from New York, that he took this so well, because a lot of us that voted for this bill gagged quite a bit in voting for it.

My question is, What now is going to be done with the DP camps? Are we going to do away with them?

Mr. FELLOWS. Of course, we cannot compel other nations to do these things, but we do ask and urge that they be done. The best information we can get is that if we will give them this bargaining proposition so that they can use it around the table, we can close these camps. I believe fully that it will be done, because everybody connected with it is just as anxious as the gentleman and I that that question be solved.

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

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

Mr. VURSELL. I was off the floor and came in just this minute. There are two points I should like to have cleared up.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Have you increased the quotas in the conference report to something like 220,000? That is, instead of 202,000?

Mr. FELLOWS. No; we had 220,000 in the House bill, H. R. 6396, and there are 220,000 here.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, there are 15,000 already here.

Mr. FELLOWS. That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM. And 3,000 orphans and 2,000 Czechs?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is right.

Mr. VURSELL. That is my understanding. Now are all the children counted in the 220,000?

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

Mr. VURSELL. Are they counted as citizens?

Mr. FELLOWS. Orphans are especially exempted from the operation of the quota.

Mr. VURSELL. And not more than half of the 220,000 came come in in any 1 year?

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not say that, because that is a matter of shipping. They say now "not over 200,000."

Mr. VURSELL. They will be not over that in any 1 year; is that correct?

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not think we have to worry about that, because it will not be until next fall until this thing is set up.

Mr. VURSELL. That is probably true, but I just wanted to know.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. CHADWICK. If the gentleman will permit me to revert to the very concise statement of his own views and his own motives which preceded the colloquy which we just heard. In order to save the time of the House, I desire to be associated not merely with the very effective result of the gentleman's leadership, but with the line of thought and the persuasions which induced him to take such action. He expressed better than I could possibly express them the views which I entertained, not only in Committee and in the House, but in the Conference Committee, and which caused me to sign this report on the part of the managers of the House with confidence that we have been able to make a contribution in a field which touches not only practical economics but the strongest motivations of humanity.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman has made a fine statement, and I thank him.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. MASON. As one who served as the ranking Member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House for 10 years, I want to say that the gentleman and his committee have done a magnificent job. It is not exactly as I would have it, of course, but it is a magnificent job, and I want to give him full credit for it.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I want to agree with the gentleman from Maine, our able chairman. This is the best we could get under the circumstances. I can speak my own sentiments, and I think I can speak the sentiment of all those who served with the House conferees to the extent that we wholeheartedly favored the so-called Fellows bill, because in our honest estimation and sincere belief, it was fair and it was a more equitable approach to and solution of the problem. However, we had a gun barrel at our heads. That gun barrel was the element of time. The legislative sands in our congressional hourglass are running out. I repeat, 't was either this compromise or nothing. Of course, there are features in the report that we did not want—one or two items almost gagged me to swallow but we have done the best we could, believe me. I want to congratulate our chairman and commend him upon his untiring efforts and his loyalty and devotion to this most difficult problem; truly, he has done a wonderful job. I know because I sat by him and watched him for three long days during sessions of the conference of the House and Senate. We did not capitulate—we did not surrender our principles. We did not raise any white flag—had it not been for the time element and immediate adjournment slapping us in the face I would have hung the jury until Gabriel blew taps on his trumpet. I would have never compromised. I would have demanded the Fellows bill. But my colleagues, 200,000 poor, miserable, pathetic people were hanging in the balance, their fate was in our hands—with this upon my conscience and in my heart—I therefore reluctantly signed the conference report—for it was better than no bill at all.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. The question has been asked me by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] as to the disposition of these displaced persons who have come to this country. Would the gentleman care to answer that question as far as he can at this time?

Mr. FELLOWS. Of course, they are taken care of in that part of the country where that type of worker or professional person is required and can be assimilated in the community. These people who come here can be settled in the part of the country and in a community where their services or professions can best be utilized.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. Am I correct in believing that in the House bill there was a provision by the terms of which these people would be admitted in accordance with the proportion that existed in the various camps by racial or religious groups?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is true.

Mr. DEVITT. Is that provision retained in the conference report?

Mr. FELLOWS. It is not.

Mr. DEVITT. Was there not a provision in the House bill giving preferential treatment to farmers?

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes, but this is really preferential in the sense that the 30 percent has to be farmers. In our bill we set out farmers, doctors, dentists, and so forth, but in this bill 30 percent farmers have the preference.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Of course, it stands to reason that all who come here will stay here because there is no place to which they can be sent if they violate our laws.

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes. They will come in anyway, only they are coming in at present under provisions that do not screen—under the provisions that do not require that this group or that group or any other group have a fair share. There have been 32,000 already brought in, and there has been no plan as to the manner of doing it. This will not add a single, solitary person that will not be here anyway in the next 5 or 6 or 7 years.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The parliamentary debates in the Australian Parliament in the last few days shows conclusively that Britain will have to move 10,000,000 people out of England during the next few years. If 10,000,000 are to be moved out of England, we might as well get clear that pressure will be put on this country to take a great many of them.

Mr. FELLOWS. May I say this, in submitting our original displaced persons legislation, the committee felt it offered you an elegant garment—a "creation," if you will—which clothed a delicate situation suitably, adequately, and becomingly. Each nationality and group received fair consideration. The fact that one or another had perhaps had preferential treatment in the past might have explained but could not have excused any other procedure on our part.

This conference report now offered for your action represents something less than I hoped, and better than I feared. If, as I believe, we are faced with a problem requiring solution, this is one offered by the Senate and House conferees, and the only one to be hoped for. This conference report is not the bill that passed the House, but is a compromise between the position of the Senate and this body. This legislation will permit admission of 220,000. I believe some legislation is necessary. I believe it should be adopted.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is this the best we can do?

Mr. FELLOWS. Indeed it is. It is this or nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. ROSS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the statement of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons urged by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I will vote in favor of his motion to recommit this conference report, and will vote against the adoption of the report if the motion to recommit fails. The bill in its present form is worse than no bill. It is viciously discriminatory. It is hard for me to believe that, in a country that fought nazism so successfully, and is now attempting to stop communism, any Member of Congress can consider voting in favor of a bill that would grant priorities to prospective immigrants who were part and parcel, if not the backbone, of the Hitler regime during its worst days. Rather than to give them priorities in seeking admission to this country, Congress should bar them forever. No bill is better than a bill in the form now before us.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when we had before us for consideration a few days ago the Fellows bill which provided for the bringing into this country of 202,000 foreigners without much regard as to who they are or where they come from, we were told that we must pass that bill or some great calamity might befall us. Many of us refused to be persuaded. They said many times that the Fellows bill represented a great amount of labor done by many members of the Judiciary Committee and that it was the best possible bill that could be worked out. They said that they would oppose all amendments to the Fellows bill and they did their best in that respect, but some amendments were made. They accepted those amendments and still claimed the bill was the best that could be made.

The Fellows bill went to conferees and now it comes back changed beyond recognition. Some of the conferees say the changes are terrible. But those who said that the original Fellows bill should not be changed are now advocating this conference report claiming that it is absolutely necessary that we pass it and that it will solve the problem.

This only proves that this method of trying to solve this problem is absolutely wrong. This displaced persons problem is a matter of relief. It is not an immigration problem and should not be solved by the Immigration Department. It should be solved by the United Nations. This conference report should be voted down.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker there is one aspect of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] which gives me concern. I have every respect for his views, and I recognize that the position he takes is consistent with his whole approach to the question. But when he suggests that some of the rest of us, who in association with him shared the responsibility of the conference on behalf of the House, were in any way less attached to our House bill than he, or less alert in its support, he both misappraises the realities of the then situation and underestimates his colleagues' contribution.

There was no "abject surrender" of anything which was practically obtainable. The distinguished Senators who sat with us had a right to their views, and it was obvious that they proposed to adhere to certain of them. At one stage of the negotiation, the gentleman from New York gave the strongest possible evidence of sharing this view; he joined us and the Senate conferees in what was at very least a tentative meeting of the minds.

Subsequently we all reviewed the basis of this honestly intended attempt at agreement the next day, at the request of my friend from New York; recognizing that he had misjudged the effect of the formula upon one group of displaced persons. But that neither he or we had misjudged the mettle of the Senatorial conferees became increasingly clear in that very discussion.

The gentleman gives his case away as it seems to me, when he admits that he prefers even now no bill to the present bill; that was the real alternative with which we were confronted. Five of us on the contrary preferred to save the bill; we wanted to get started with the DP problem, and to give immediate relief to more than 200,000 human beings, even if in so doing we missed keeping some individuals (a substantial number, in fact), who were certainly also entitled to sympathetic consideration. The House has intentionally failed these unfortunate individuals at no point. Our bill included them, but in the last resort we thought it better to postpone their hopes than completely to disappoint the hopes of so many more of their equally deserving companions in misery.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the conference report now under consideration which would admit 220,000 displaced persons to this country. As has been emphasized in this debate, the Senate and House conferees have determined that this is the best bill which could be agreed upon.

I have strongly advocated the passage of legislation which would provide for the admission to the United States of a fair share of the unfortunate and homeless displaced persons of Europe. I have felt for some time that it was not only our moral obligation, but that it would also be economically sound for us to take the lead in providing a haven for these persons who were made homeless through no fault of their own.

I supported and would have preferred the so-called Fellows bill as enacted by

the House, and I think it is unfortunate that the provisions contained in the House bill did not prevail. However, since it appears it is a question of taking this measure now before the House or nothing at all, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield to nobody in my affection and regard for the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], and in my affection and regard for all Members who were managers on the part of the House, but I do nevertheless feel that there was a surrender by them too quickly, and that this bill is not a compromise. It is an abasement. It is a complete surrender, because the Fellows bill which was universally, throughout the length and breadth of the Nation, recognized as a fair bill, has been utterly and completely scuttled and sabotaged. In its place we have the Revercomb bill with slight modifications which was universally condemned as highly discriminatory, racially and religiously.

The House rejected the Revercomb bill which my colleague of the House conferees now asks you to accept.

I had hoped that the members of the conference, as far as the House was concerned, would have stood by their guns and insisted upon the Fellows bill, and not hoisted the white flag as quickly as they did and accept almost in toto the Revercomb bill, which was generally objected to by all well-known commentators and editors, by all religious organizations interested, and by every fair-minded man and woman who examined it. It was not a case of this bill or nothing at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Were we not told by the managers on the part of the Senate after we had consulted for two whole days that if we did not make the recession there would be no bill, that they were prepared to walk out?

Mr. CELLER. I do not like to have a gun held at my head in that fashion. That is what was done. The Senate conferees said to us: "Stand and deliver."

I was not going to quail, I am too long in this business to shiver before any Member of the other body who tried to bulldoze me in that fashion. It would have been far better if we had no bill at all and allowed the present situation to stand with the President's directive of December 21, 1945, concerning the DP's and the normal operation of the quota law.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Is not the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania the same kind of statement one always hears in a conference with the Senate, the usual statement made by every conferee who yields?

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

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman from Maine will yield me five additional minutes I will yield. Otherwise I must proceed with my explanation.

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Did not the gentleman agree with the rest of us that we would accept the proposition made by the Senate; and then did not the gentleman come forward and say that his conscience would not permit him to go along with it?

Mr. CELLER. That is not the exact situation. I will reflect the exact situation.

The Members on the part of the House offered several compromises to the Senate conferees which they turned down with all emphasis. They were adamant and most intransigent and unyielding save that two of their number, the distinguished Senators from Michigan and West Virginia, HOMER FERGUSON and HARVEY KILGORE, were most understanding and aware of the human side of the problem. Then in the interest of getting something harmonious, I said I would accept the cut-off date Senator REVERCOMB demanded, with the Balts originally constituting a 50 percent chunk of the 200,000 quota reduced to 40 percent and the preference for farmers reduced from 50 percent to 30 percent. But overnight I discovered that what I had accepted was an abject and unwarranted surrender and that the officials of the State Department told me that the so-called cut-off date, which was demanded, namely December 21, 1945, would make the act utterly unworkable in that there was a paucity of records on that date and that most of the more unfortunate DP's had come into the camps after that date. They would be excluded.

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

Mr. CELLER. Just let me finish, then I will gladly yield.

The experts of the State and Justice Departments told me December 22, 1945, as a cut-off date, would make the act utterly unworkable and that it would deliberately discriminate against the Jews who crowded into the DP camps after that date. Many of these pillaged and plundered Jews had fled from Poland after the Kielce pogrom which had occurred July 3, 1946. They would be denied any relief by the Revercomb bill and the conference report, now before us. We had set in the Fellows bill a cut-off date as of April 21, 1947; you must remember that the cut-off date December 22, 1945 was only a few months after the shooting stopped and there were 8,000,000 people wandering hither and tither with no place to rest their weary heads and there was no developed procedure in the camps, there were no records. There was naught but confusion. The date April 21, 1947, was the date the camps were ordered closed by General Clay with agreement of the International Refugee Organization. It is utterly impossible to enforce and administer this bill as envisaged by this conference report if you use the cut-off date of December 21, 1945. Furthermore you deliberately proscribe Jews. Only about 6,000 Jews can be helped out of the 200,000 by this conference report.

Furthermore, those who are most deserving, those who fled from religious and racial persecution, those who suffered most, those who were the most hopeless, helpless, and homeless, the Jews—six million of whose coreligionists were martyred—came into these camps after the date set by this conference report.

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

Mr. CELLER. The stand-and-deliver attitude of the Senate produces a bill in which we are not merciful. There is not an ounce of humanity in it. A situation developed in the conference where a certain gentleman on the other side of the Capitol because of his proscriptive attitude sought to bend the House conferees to his proscriptive viewpoint. I refused to yield as did the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]. We refrained from signing the report. Even the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] said publicly they signed the report "with reluctance."

I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FELLOWS. Is it not a fact that the gentleman himself agreed on the date of December 22, 1945, with the proviso, of course, that the other provisions were changed—50–50?

Mr. CELLER. I do not deny that, but we were still in conference and you cannot tell me that while we are still in conference the provisions of the whole bill cannot be opened and reopened and again reopened for reconsideration. I had only tentatively agreed to certain provisions. There were many questions and differences still unresolved and unsettled.

After the night of the second conference I consulted with those who were in position to know, the Immigration Service and the State Depaartment, and I was told that that cut-off date was highly unfair, utterly unjust, and deliberately discriminatory. After such—shall I say newly discovered information—I reopened the question of cut-off date. I had that right. No one shall gainsay me that right. If there is injustice I am not going to allow protocol to stand in the way of stamping it out.

Now, see what you have done in this conference report. You are going to admit not deserving people, you are going to help not the displaced persons in the main. You are going to help whom? The Volkdeutsche. You are going to take for 2 years the combined quotas for Germany and Austria, and you are going to issue an engraved invitation to the Volkdeutsche to come in to the extent of 50 percent of those combined quotas. You will thus admit 27,000 of them.

Who are the Volkdeutsches? You ought to know something about them. They were the advance guard who fertilized the field for Hitler's Panzer divisions. They were the natives, citizens, and subjects of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Hungary, Rumania, of German ethnic origin. They were what Hitler called the Herrenvolk. They were like the German-American Bunds in the United States who turned against the Allies. These Volkdeutsche did all in their power to make it easy for Hitler's advance. Hitler's capture and overrunning of Czechoslovakia and Poland was

made far easier for him because of the fifth column work that was done by these Volkdeutsches. Fritz Henlein was one of them. Others come to mind readily. If Hitler were alive today he could qualify. He was born in Austria of German ethnic origin.

Are we going to forget so soon the purpose of which this recent war was fought? Are we going to admit these people against whom our veterans fought, bled and died, and went through the valley of the shadow? I cannot subscribe to this kind of procedure. This is the uttermost injustice.

You must in good conscience, and if humanity is your guide, if decency is your guide, reject this report if only because of the admission of these Volkdeutsche. These Volkdeutsches are not DP's. They are not in DP camps. They have no relation to the solving of the DP problem. They should have no place in this conference report.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the gentleman that I agree with him. I went through the DP camps and the only way you can distribute the admission of these people fairly is according to the elements now in the camps. The dating back is distinctly a discriminatory act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not want to make a speech, but I would like to know specifically who we bring in under this bill, without covering all the history of it.

Mr. CELLER. The lady should read the report.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. We have not the report. We are going to vote soon. We want to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. The lady had that explained. I want to go into other matters.

Let us see what else happens in this bill.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. What effect will our participation in the International Refugee Organization have on this section permitting these Germans who are not displaced persons to come in?

Mr. CELLER. It will have a very deleterious effect, because the International Refugee Organization deliberately said these Volkdeutsches were not displaced persons and the International Refugee Organization would have nothing to do with them. Why? Because they were the ones who sought to balk and sabotage the efforts of the Allies.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield just for a question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is the gentleman preaching the doctrine of hate?

Mr. CELLER. I am not preaching the doctrine of hate, but I do not want to reward my enemies, I do not want to bring in those who did everything in their power to make it impossible for the allied effort to succeed.

I would rather have the gentleman who just interrogated me speak of "mercy." I would remind him as I would remind those plumping for the Revercomb formula the remarks of Matthew:

> Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.

I ask gentle consideration, I ask mercy for those who have suffered tortures of the damned just because they were born of a certain race but yet prayed to your God and mine.

I also ask for fair judgment and remind you of James, who said:

> For he shall have judgment without mercy that showeth no mercy and mercy rejoiceth against judgment.

Beyond all that, see what else is done by this conference report? There was a rape by Russia of the independent Republics of Latvia, Esthonia, and Lithuania. This report gives the imprimatur to Russia's rape and "annexation" of those Republics. It says in so many words that there is recognized the de facto annexation by Russia of these three independent Republics made independent as the result of the First World War, and beyond that recognizes the annexation by Russia of that part of Poland east of the Curzon line. They do that in order to bring in to the extent of 40 percent of the quota of 200,000 the so-called Balts and Poles east of the Curzon line. Whoever heard that a committee of conference should indicate what the foreign policy of the United States should be? We never recognized that annexation by Rusisa of those Republics, but if we pass this bill we have the temerity—and I say "temerity"—to tell Russia "You have a free hand; you can do anything you d—— please with those republics."

Now, the State Department has violently objected to this indirect recognition given to Russia's action.

This bill, I want you to know, gentlemen—and you are going to hear from the people back home—is not without religious significance; it is not without racial preference. You cannot keep religion out of it no matter what you try. Hitler did not keep religion out of his cunning calculations and the victims of his cunning and mania are in these camps. Those people who first felt the scourge of Hitler, those who were the greatest victims of Hitler's sadism, those who perished to the extent of 6,000,000 in the crematoria and in the suffocation chambers, and who were held to languish and die behind the barbed wire, namely those of the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are caught between the upper and the nether stones of the report's discrimination. Yes, you say, "Come in, you 28,000 Volksdeutsche." What do you say to those of the Jewish faith because of this cut-off date? You say, "We will only take in of the 200,000, 6,000 Jews." Think of it—only 6,000 Jews of the quota of 200,000 are admissible under the conference report.

I am making a special plea for my people. Why should I not? They have suffered immeasurably. Their fate was and still is like one on a sea without a shore. Where can they go?

I have before me the Fulton House Foreign Affairs report containing the passengers from the ship manifests of some of the refugee ships that went to Canada and to Brazil and to Venezuela and to other countries. You will find among those listed Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Greek Catholics, Baptists, and Orthodox, but not a single Jew was taken by any of those nations out of these DP camps. We, too, are now saying, "No, we do not want the people of the race of Isaac and Jacob and Abraham; let them go hang; let them be liquidated. Let them die in the camps." Palestine is closed to them by the cease-fire order. We do not know what their future will be as to Palestine. They are apparently unwanted everywhere save in Palestine and even there the barriers are up. Should not the great United States at least show the way for others and take a fair share of these Jewish DP's? The conferees would say "No." I say "Yes."

We do not dissipate the DP problem by adopting the legislation agreed upon by the conferees. The problems of maintaining the camps will still be with us, military personnel will still have to be assigned to DP centers, the necessities of life will still have to be provided for the remaining DP's. Enlightened self-interest, at the very least, should prompt a better solution.

Moreover, the fact that 30 percent preference is to be given to farmers makes the whole situation ridiculous. In the United States camps 17.5 are farmers, in the British camps, the percent is 35.1, and the French camps hold 39.1. The result will be that we will empty the British and French camps before we empty our own.

It must be remembered, also that ours is a mixed economy which demands not only farm labor but plumbers, latherers, doctors, dentists, nurses, domestics, garment workers, carpenters, and so forth. No adequate consideration was given to these needs.

NO LAW BETTER

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the displaced persons bill as finally shaped by this conference report is a noxious mess which defies digestion.

It is compounded of large portions of fear, hate, and suspicion, faintly flavored with shame.

I cannot vote for this bitter gruel of legislation.

No law at all is better than this, and I shall vote to send the report back to conference.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on this bill immediately preceding the ordering of the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CELLER moves that the conference report accompanying S. 2242 be recommitted to the committee of conference.

Mr. FELLOWS. 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 offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 40, noes 75.

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 133, nays 266, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—133

Albert	Griffiths	Multer
Allen, La.	Hagen	Murray, Tenn.
Angell	Harrison	Norton
Bakewell	Havenner	O'Brien
Battle	Heffernan	O'Toole
Beckworth	Herter	Pace
Bender	Heselton	Passman
Blatnik	Holifield	Peterson
Bloom	Huber	Pfeifer
Boggs, Del.	Isacson	Philbin
Bolton	Jackson, Wash.	Pickett
Brehm	Javits	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Jenkins, Ohio	Potts
Bryson	Judd	Powell
Buchanan	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Buckley	Kean	Price, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Kearney	Rankin
Carroll	Keating	Reeves
Celler	Kefauver	Richards
Colmer	Kelley	Riley
Cooper	Kennedy	Rooney
Courtney	Keogh	Sabath
Cravens	King	Sadowski
Crosser	Kirwan	Sarbacher
Davis, Ga.	Klein	Shafer
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Sikes
Delaney	Lanham	Smathers
Dewitt	Lewis, Ohio	Somers
Dingell	Lodge	Spence
Donohue	Lucas	Stanley
Douglas	Lynch	Stratton
Eberharter	McCormack	Taylor
Elsaesser	McCulloch	Teague
Elston	McDonough	Thomas, Tex.
Evins	McGregor	Twyman
Fallon	McMahon	Van Zandt
Feighan	McMillen, Ill.	Vinson
Fogarty	MacKinnon	Walter
Forand	Madden	Welch
Fulton	Mahon	Wheeler
Gallagher	Marcantonio	Whittington
Gathings	Mason	Williams
Gearhart	Miller, Calif.	Winstead
Gore	Morgan	
Grant, Ala.	Morris	

NAYS—266

Abbitt	Beall	Burleson
Abernethy	Bell	Busbey
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Butler
Allen, Ill.	Bennett, Mo.	Byrnes, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bishop	Camp
	Blackney	Canfield
Anderson, Calif.	Bland	Cannon
Andresen, August H.	Boggs, La.	Carson
	Bonner	Case, N. J.
Andrews, Ala.	Boykin	Case, S. Dak.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bradley	Chadwick
Arends	Bramblett	Chapman
Arnold	Brooks	Chelf
Auchincloss	Brophy	Chenoweth
Banta	Buck	Chiperfield
Barden	Buffett	Church
Barrett	Bulwinkle	Clason
Bates, Mass.	Burke	Coffin
Cole, Kans.	Hinshaw	Norrell
Cole, Mo.	Hobbs	O'Hara
Cole, N. Y.	Hoeven	O'Konski
Combs	Hoffman	Patman
Cooley	Holmes	Patterson
Corbett	Hope	Phillips, Calif.
Cotton	Horan	Phillips, Tenn.
Cox	Hull	Plumley
Crawford	Jackson, Calif.	Potter
Crow	Jarman	Poulson
Cunningham	Jenison	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Jenkins, Pa.	Priest
Dague	Jennings	Rains
Davis, Tenn.	Jensen	Ramey
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Rayburn
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Ill.	Redden
Deane	Jones, Ala.	Reed, Ill.
D'Ewart	Jones, N. C.	Reed, N. Y.
Dirksen	Jones, Wash.	Rees
Dolliver	Jonkman	Riehlman
Domengeaux	Kearns	Rizley
Dondero	Kee	Rockwell
Dorn	Keefe	Rogers, Fla.
Doughton	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Mass.
Durham	Kilburn	Rohrbough
Eaton	Kilday	Ross
Ellis	Kunkel	Russell
Ellsworth	Landis	Sadlak
Engel, Mich.	Larcade	St. George
Fellows	Latham	Sanborn
Fenton	Lea	Sasscer
Fernandez	LeCompte	Schwabe, Mo.
Fisher	LeFevre	Schwabe, Okla.
Flannagan	Lemke	Scoblick
Fletcher	Lesinski	Scott, Hardie
Folger	Lewis, Ky.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Foote	Lichtenwalter	
Fuller	Love	Scrivner
Gamble	Lusk	Seely-Brown
Garmatz	Lyle	Sheppard
Gary	McConnell	Short
Gavin	McCowen	Simpson, Ill.
Gillette	McDowell	Smith, Kans.
Gillie	McGarvey	Smith, Maine
Goff	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Goodwin	Mack	Smith, Va.
Gordon	Macy	Smith, Wis.
Gorski	Maloney	Snyder
Graham	Manasco	Stefan
Granger	Martin, Iowa	Stevenson
Grant, Ind.	Mathews	Stockman
Gregory	Meade, Ky.	Sundstrom
Gross	Meade, Md.	Taber
Gwinn, N. Y.	Merrow	Talle
Gwynne, Iowa	Meyer	Thompson
Hale	Michener	Tibbott
Hall, Leonard W.	Miller, Conn.	Tollefson
	Miller, Md.	Towe
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Trimble
Hand	Mills	Vail
Hardy	Mitchell	Vorys
Harless, Ariz.	Monroney	Vursell
Harness, Ind.	Morrison	Wadsworth
Harris	Morton	Weichel
Hart	Muhlenberg	Whitten
Harvey	Mundt	Wigglesworth
Hays	Murdock	Wilson, Tex.
Hébert	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Hedrick	Nicholson	Wolverton
Hendricks	Nixon	Woodruff
Hess	Nodar	Worley
Hill	Norblad	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—31

Bates, Ky.	Hartley	Rich
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Ind.	Rivers
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson
Clevenger	Johnson, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Clippinger	Kerr	Stigler
Coudert	Lane	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	Ludlow	West
Engle, Calif.	Mansfield	Whitaker
Gossett	Peden	Wilson, Ind.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Ploeser	Wood
	Regan	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Whitaker.

Mr. HART, Mr. SASSCER, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. BELL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ANGELL, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. EBERHARTER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF TEMPORARY HOUSING

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5710) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, 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 6, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 5. The Defense Homes Corporation is authorized to convey, without reimbursement therefor, to Howard University, a corporation organized pursuant to an act of Congress, all of its right, title, and interest in certain lands in the District of Columbia, together with the improvements constructed thereon and the personal property used in connection therewith, and commonly known as Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall, 1919 Third Street NW., and George Washington Carver Hall, 211 Elm Street NW.: *Provided*, That no employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia who, on the date of approval of this act, is a tenant of either Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall or George Washington Carver Hall shall, unless quarters were assigned to such tenant on a transient basis or on the sole basis that the tenant was enrolled at an educational institution be evicted from such halls within 4 years after the approval of this act, except where such tenant commits a nuisance or otherwise violates any obligation of tenancy.

"The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to discharge the indebtedness of the Defense Homes Corporation to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in an amount equal to the Defense Homes Corporation's net investment in these properties as of the date of transfer, as determined by the President of the Defense Homes Corporation, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to discharge the indebtedness of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Treasury in like amount as of the same date.

"SEC. 6. The right, title, and interest in any lands, together with the improvements constructed thereon, which are conveyed pursuant to the authority granted by section 5 hereof, shall revert to the United States upon a written finding made by the President prior to July 1, 1963, that the property is needed by the United States in connection with a national defense emergency."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN ARMED FORCES

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr.

BROOKS] may be excused as a conferee on the bill, S. 2655.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] to fill the vacancy.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

PROVIDING FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACTIVITIES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 418) to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) "An Act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "hereinafter declared to be a public nuisance".

Page 2, lines 13 and 14, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "such interstate water and tributaries thereof", and insert the following words "surface and underground waters".

Page 9, line 11, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$200,000" and insert the figure "$250,000".

Page 11, line 25, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$20,000,000" and insert the figure "$22,500,000".

Page 12, line 25 of the amendment of the House, after the words "study of" insert the word "water", and strike out the word "of" after the word "pollution".

Page 13, line 1, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "interstate waters".

Page 13, line 2, of the amendment of the House, before the word "pollution" insert the word "water", and after the word "pollution" strike out the words "of interstate waters".

Page 14, line 17 through line 23, of the amendment of the House, strike out all after the words "SEC. 9. (a)" and insert the following: "Five officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act. Officers appointed pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 per centum of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b) of the Public Health Service Act; but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b)."

And the House agree to the same.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
TOM PICKETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEO. W. MALONE,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
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 amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The first two amendments apply to Sec. 2 (a), lines 4, 5, and 6, on page 18 of the bill. The language substituted more clearly defines the authority of the Surgeon General with respect to the preparation and adoption of comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of surface and underground waters.

The amendment to Sec. 5 (line 3, page 25), increases by $50,000 the maximum individual loan which may be made under the Act.

The amendment to Sec. 7 (line 16, page 27), increases by $2,500,000 the maximum authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, for the purpose of making loans under Section 5 of the Act.

The purpose of the amendments to Sec. 8 (b) (lines 16, 17, and 18, page 28), is to expand the service of the Public Health Service station authorized to be erected at Cincinnati, Ohio, in connection with research and study of water pollution and the training of personnel in work related to control of water pollution.

The amendment with reference to Sec. 9 (a), (lines 10 to 16, page 30), substitutes a new Sec. 9 (a), which is required for the purpose set forth in the following letter:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, Zone 25, May 14, 1948.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reference to S. 418, which your Committee reported out, with amendments, on April 28, 1948.

Section 9 (a) of S. 418 as reported authorizes additional appointments to be made at higher grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service pursuant to section 208 (b) of the Public Health Service Act to assist the Service in carrying out its new or expanded activities under S. 418. Since our letter of January 19, 1948, to you on this bill, however, the Congress has enacted Public Law 425, which amends the provisions of the Public Health Service Act in several respects, primarily in the matter of appointment and promotion of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service. As a result of Public Law 425, the authority to make additional appointments at higher grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, formerly contained in section 208 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, is now contained in section 207 (b) of that Act, in a somewhat revised form. In order, therefore, to accomplish the purposes for which section 9 (a) of S. 418 was intended, the following is suggested in lieu of such section 9 (a):

(a) Five officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act. Officers appointed pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 per centum of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b) of the Public Health Service Act; but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b).

The short time available for necessary action on the amendment suggested by this letter has not permitted us to obtain advice from the Bureau of the Budget as to the relationship of this amendment to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

J. DONALD KINGSLEY,
Acting Administrator.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
TOM PICKETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES CODE, TITLE 18

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3190) to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, following:

"13. Laws of States adopted for areas within Federal jurisdiction."

Insert:

"14. Applicability to Canal Zone."

Page 5, line 4, after "States" insert, ", except the Canal Zone."

Page 8, after line 15, insert:

"§ 14. Applicability to Canal Zone."

"In addition to the sections of this title which by their terms apply to and within the Canal Zone, the following sections of this title shall likewise apply to and within the Canal Zone: 6, 8, 11, 331, 371, 472, 474, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 488, 489, 490, 499, 502, 506, 594, 595, 598, 600, 601, 604, 605, 608, 611, 612, 703, 756, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 915, 917, 951, 953, 954, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 1017, 1073, 1301, 1364, 1382, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1546, 1584, 1621, 1622, 1761, 1821, 1914, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2199, 2231, 2234, 2235, 2274, 2275, 2277, 2384, 2385, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 3059, 3105, 3109."

Page 91, strike out

"610. Contributions by national banks or corporations."

And insert:

"610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations."

Page 104, strike out lines 4 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

"§ 610. Contributions by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations

"It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political con-

vention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

"Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer or any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"For the purposes of this section 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exist for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

Page 117, line 8, strike out all after "receiver," down to and including "System," in line 15.

Page 118, line 18, strike out all after "care," down to and including "institution," in line 23.

Page 134, line 19, after "both" insert "; or if he negligently suffers such person to escape, he shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Page 158, after line 12, insert "While any foreign government is a member both of the International Monetary Fund and of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, this section shall not apply to the sale or purchase of bonds, securities, or other obligations of such government or any political subdivision thereof or of any organization or association acting for or on behalf of such government or political subdivision, or to making of any loan to such government, political subdivision, organization, or association."

Page 367, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive, and insert "The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of all offenses against the laws of the United States.

"Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

Page 415, line 10, after "Zone," insert "District of Columbia."

Page 415, after line 17, insert:

"Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 416, after line 21, insert:

"Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 448, lines 24 and 25, strike out "the Revised Statutes (1 U. S. C., sec. 1)" and insert "Title 1 of the United States Code."

Page 456, strike out lines 3 to 21, inclusive.

Page 456, line 22, strike out "19" and insert "18."

Page 457, line 3, strike out "20" and insert "19."

Page 457, strike out lines 8 to 15, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 20. This act shall take effect September 1, 1948."

Page 457, line 16, strike out "22" and insert "21."

Page 463, about middle of page, strike out

[July 3	128	4, 5	40	755, 756	16		705, 706]

Page 467, below middle of page, strike out

[June 20	634		4	49	1556	16	705
Do	635	1, 2	49		1557	22	248]

and insert:

"June 20	635	1, 2	49		1557	22	248"

Page 470, after

"June 8	178	1, 2, 3	59	234, 235		18	241, 241a, 242"

insert:

"July 31	339		9	59	516	31	804b"

Page 471, at the end of the schedule of repeals on this page, insert:

"1947—							
Apr. 16	39			61	52	18	411
May 16	73			61	97	18	744h–1
June 21	111			61	134	18	244
June 23	120		304	61	159	2	251"

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FREEDOM DAY

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day, and ask for its immediate consideration. I have consulted with the leaders on both sides.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to issue a proclamation designating the 1st day of February of each year as National Freedom Day for the purpose of commemorating the signing by President Abraham Lincoln, on February 1, 1865, of the joint resolution adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, proposing the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

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

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. McGARVEY. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill which has been reached on the Consent Calendar today will authorize and request the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day and invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and thanksgiving. As you all know, on February 1, 1865, President Abraham Lincoln signed the joint resolution, which had previously been adopted by the Congress, proposing the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution.

I should like to repeat for you at this time the immortal words of that amendment: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." These words are the foundation of our form of government with its emphasis on the freedom of the individual and the human liberties which belong to every citizen of the United States. It is therefore with pride in our free Nation that I introduced this resolution at the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Since that time I have been striving to obtain approval of the legislation.

I wish to thank the members of the Judiciary Committee and, in particular, the members of the subcommittee which handled the resolution, headed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], for the interest and cooperation they have displayed in reporting the legislation, also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK].

I should like to pause here to pay tribute to the founder of National Freedom Day, Maj. R. R. Wright. It is regrettable that Major Wright is not with us today to realize the fulfillment of his long years of hard work and inspiring efforts. Born in slavery, Major Wright rose to prominence as a great American and occupied an unequalled position in the hearts of his fellow Americans. The story of Major Wright is truly the story of America, for in no other country today is it possible for a citizen to achieve such outstanding success. His success, however, would not have occurred had the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution not been approved. Since its signing is one of the cornerstones in the foundation of our American traditions, I am proud that we have today passed the resolution commemorating its inception.

PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY OF GOVERNMENT HEADSTONES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4272) to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, 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 2, strike out all after "cemeteries," down to and including "costs." in line 14 and insert "The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized and directed to compile a list of the names of all members of the armed forces of the United States who died while serving in such forces in the overseas theaters of operations on or after September 3, 1939, and whose bodies have not been recovered or identified or have been buried at sea. Upon the compilation of such list of names and other appropriate data, the American Battle Monuments Commission and the Secretary of the Army are authorized and directed to provide for the inscribing of each such name and pertinent

data with respect to the individual on the wall of a chapel or other apppropriate memorial erected by the American Battle Monuments Commission or by the Department of the Army. In determining the particular chapel or other memorial on the wall of which any particular name shall be inscribed, the Commission and the Secretary shall follow the general rule of having the name inscribed upon the wall of that chapel or other memorial which is appropriate in view of the circumstances under which the deceased died in the service of his country."

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.

EMERGENCY FUND FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3218) to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems, 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:

After line 10, insert:

"SEC. 2. The term 'unusual or emergency conditions,' as used in this act, shall be construed to mean canal bank failures, generator failures, damage to transmission lines; or other physical failures or damage, or acts of God, or of the public enemy, fires, floods, drought, epidemics, strikes, or freight embargoes, or conditions, causing or threatening to cause interruption in water or power service."

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.

TOLL BRIDGE OVER DELAWARE RIVER

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6465) to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935, be, and the same is hereby, amended and supplemented by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(e) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section or of any other Act of the Congress, the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey is hereby authorized (1) to fix and charge tolls for transit over any bridge heretofore or hereafter constructed by it across the Delaware River in accordance with the provisions of the original compact or agreement between said Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and said State of New Jersey which is set forth in section 9 of said Act approved August 30, 1935, as amended with the consent of Congress by the compact or supplemental agreement which is set forth in the Act approved August 4, 1947; and (2) to unite or group any such bridges into a single project for financing purposes and to continue to fix and adjust the tolls for the use of the bridges in such project and pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of said original compact or agreement as so amended: *Provided, however*, That the tolls for the use of any such bridge or the bridges in any such project may be applied by said Commission, if and to the extent permitted by its contract with the holders of its bonds, to the payment of all or part of the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating any bridge or bridges now operated by said Commission free of tolls: *And provided further*, That after the cost of any such bridge or of the bridges in any such project shall be amortized, such bridge or bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of tolls shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide funds not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of such bridge or bridges, and any bridge or bridges now operated by said Commission free of tolls."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 20, strike out the words "that the" and all of lines 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and lines 1 and 2 on page 3 through the word "further."

Page 3, line 5, after the word "tolls", strike out the remainder of the page.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3735, an act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see page 8937 of today's RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, with an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the provisions of H. R. 6263, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,—

TITLE I—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER

SEC. 1. This title may be cited as the "Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act."

SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, of assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as "agricultural commodities"), and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of its Board of Directors.

SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it shall have been brought within 4 years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) shall be applicable to the Corporation.

(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States with respect to the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in the conduct of its business. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

(h) May contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real property or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business.

(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation: *Provided*, That the total of all money borrowed by the Corporation, other than trust deposits and advances received on sales, shall not at any time exceed in the aggregate $4,750,000,000. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as are necessary in the conduct of its business.

(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 5. Specific powers: In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 841), the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation. Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 713 (a)).

SEC. 7. Capital stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this act. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a–4), as amended, at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall consist of five members. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his nominee, shall be a member of the Board and the remaining members shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of 5 years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as practicable in each year. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. The Corporation may provide, by its bylaws, for the compensation to be paid the directors: *Provided*, That the compensation paid any director shall not exceed in the aggregate $10,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not receive additional compensation for their services on the Board. Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than one-half the members of the Board.

SEC. 10. The executive staff: Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. The executive staff shall include a controller. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. The Board shall define the authority and duties of the members of the executive staff, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as it may determine, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds of any officer or employee. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 661).

SEC. 11. Cooperation with other governmental agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

SEC. 12. Utilization of associations and trade facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, and trade facilities.

SEC. 13. Records, annual report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary of Agriculture a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary of Agriculture to the President for transmission to the Congress.

SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 ed. 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 15. Crimes and offenses.—

FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this act, or under any other act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than 5 years, or both.

EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money profit, property, or benefits through any

transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine or not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against, the Corporation.

SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware corporation: The Secretary of Agriculture, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

SEC. 18. Effective date: This title shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1948.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAW

SEC. 201. Section 8 (a) of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., supp. V, title 50, sec. 968), is amended by striking out "before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "on or before December 31, 1950."

SEC. 202. Section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., supp. V, title 15, sec. 713a-8 (a)), is amended by striking out "the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1950."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, under the Government Corporation Control Act, no wholly Government-owned corporation is continued beyond June 30 of this year, unless it is incorporated as a Government corporation.

Under that law, the Commodity Credit Corporation would expire on June 30, 1948. The bill that is before the House reincorporates the Commodity Credit Corporation and continues the life of the Corporation in perpetuity. There is no limitation on the life of the Corporation contained in the law. However, each and every one of the functions of the Commodity Credit Corporation is limited in respect to the length of time in which that function may be administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The act provides for the creation of this Government-chartered Corporation with a board of five appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. Their terms are for 5 years. The Board appoints a chairman who presumably will be the Secretary of Agriculture.

A section of the bill provides that not more than a majority of the board shall be within the Department of Agriculture, so that there will be at least three members appointed independently of the Department of Agriculture, but, of course, within the executive establishment. We have created this Corporation within the executive establishment.

The Corporation has a capital of $100,000,000 with certain assurances and guaranties in the law that any impairment of this capital shall be restored by the Treasury under an authorization for an appropriation for that purpose.

The borrowing power of the Corporation is limited to the same amount as at present, $4,750,000,000.

I neglected to say that this is now a Delaware corporation.

As I have said, the Commodity Credit Corporation is the agency for the administration of certain very important functions. They come within the following classifications: The price-support program, the supply program, the foreign-purchase program, the commodity credit program, the loan program for agricultural conservation purposes; and, of course, the subsidy program which, although it was active during the war, is now in process of liquidation.

A few days ago we passed an agricultural-support program. Title 2 of the bill now under consideration provides for the continuance of the price-support program. One of the amendments I have offered is that title 2 of this bill be stricken because we have already legislated upon the same general subject. The above, I think, in principle, is the bill.

In substance and in summary, this bill continues the Delaware corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, as a federally chartered corporation, and we are assured that the programs which I have mentioned will be continued if the Commodity Credit Corporation is continued and if the Congress, of course, supports those programs.

I reiterate that although there is no limitation upon the life of the Corporation, there is a limitation upon the period in which each and every one of these programs may be administered.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no objection to the passage of this bill.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has exercised a most useful function. It has been the means by which agricultural prices have been supported, and it has done a good job in that respect. Unless it is reincorporated under the Federal Corporations Act it will die on the 30th of this month. It is necessary to pass this legislation in order that its useful functions may continue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Commodity Credit Corporation is the agency through which price support and stabilization policies are effectuated.

The price-support bill, which we passed Saturday, is useless without the Commodity Credit Corporation as a vehicle to carry out the purpose of the support program.

This bill provides a permanent Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation. This action by Congress is made necessary because of the provisions of the Government Corporations Control Act, enacted in 1945, which requires all Government corporations to obtain a Federal charter from Congress on or before June 30, 1948, in order to continue to function as Government corporations.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized pursuant to an Executive order of the President issued on October 16, 1933, and was incorporated as a Government corporation under the laws of Delaware. It has continued to function down to the present time under a Delaware charter that has been amended at various times. Congress, from time to time, also has enacted specific legislation governing the extent and character of its lending and price-support operations and providing various limitations and safeguards with respect to these operations of the Corporation.

For several years, I have advocated legislation to make permanent the setup of the Commodity Credit Corporation. For the reasons I have just given, it is

imperative that Congress act now to provide the Corporation with a Federal charter. I feel very strongly that in doing this, Congress should provide a permanent charter, and not deal with this matter on a temporary year-to-year basis or even on a 2- or 3-year basis.

At this point, it is important to distinguish clearly between the question of providing a permanent charter for the Corporation and the question of what levels and for what period of time the Corporation is to support farm prices. Regardless of whether price-support legislation is to be developed in a long-range farm program or whether a temporary extension of existing price support legislation for 1, 2, or 4 years is to be provided, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be needed permanently and it will need a permanent charter under which to operate.

The consuming public has a vital stake in maintaining the Commodity Credit Corporation and its successful functioning in carrying out the price-support functions and ever-normal granary features of the national farm program. Had it not been for the successful operations of the Corporation in carrying out these programs, food prices to consumers would be much higher than they are.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has, during the past 15 years, become a keystone of our over-all farm program. It has helped us establish and maintain fair prices and incomes for our farmers. It has assisted us in maintaining an adequate supply of foods, feed, and fiber—even during the war years, when many farmers found that manpower, machinery, fertilizer, and other production needs were scarce or nonexistent. It has given us flexible authority to meet emergency farm problems as they have arisen.

In view of the vital service the Corporation has rendered to American agriculture, I say that the Corporation should be continued as a Federal agency—a permanent Federal agency—with authority to move promptly and decisively.

The Corporation under the Delaware charter was authorized, among other things, to engage in buying, selling, lending, and other activities with respect to agricultural commodities. Those are broad powers. Congress, however, has kept a firm control over the Delaware Corporation and would continue to keep a firm control over the Federal Corporation. That is why Congress is faced today with two important questions with respect to the Corporation: First, should Congress grant a Federal charter, and, second, should that charter give the Corporation the authority it needs to deal decisively with farm problems. Of course, the answer is "Yes."

Unless Congress is going to repeal the basic agricultural laws, there will be a continuing need for the Corporation to operate. Therefore, it is just good common sense to provide a permanent charter for the Corporation. This will be reassuring to farmers. Some of the laws which require the use of the Corporation in order to effectuate congressional price-support policies are already permanent statutes, but without the Corporation to make good on these policies, the statutes would be of no value.

This does not mean that Congress from time to time cannot change the rules, powers, duties, and limitations under which the Corporation operates. The fact is, Congress has done this in the past by various statutes all during the period under which the Corporation has operated under a Delaware charter. Congress, of course, can revoke the proposed charter at any time it desires. Hence, there seems to be no valid reason why Congress should not provide a permanent charter for the Corporation.

It is also important to provide adequate powers with sufficient flexibility to enable the Corporation to carry out its statutory responsibilities. The Corporation is charged by law with providing mandatory commodity loans and price supports at various levels. It is vitally important that the Government be prepared to make good on its commitments to farmers in these basic statutes, if the confidence of farmers in the integrity of their Government is to be preserved. Therefore, the Corporation must be clothed with adequate powers to discharge these responsibilities effectively. The proposed charter is an improvement on the Delaware charter; its powers are not as sweeping in scope, but nevertheless they appear to be adequate and they are better defined than in the old charter.

This is one issue upon which farmers everywhere are united. They realize the vital necessity for continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation. The American Farm Bureau Federation, which is the largest and most representative of the farm organizations and which represents more than one and one-quarter million farm families in 45 States and Puerto Rico, strongly urged a permanent charter for the Corporation. I fully agree with their views of this matter. It is vitally important that Congress act now so that farmers will be assured that their Government is not going to let them down.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the drive to destroy the rights of farmer cooperatives in the United States continues unabated. As in the past, the drive is spearheaded by an organization known as the National Tax Equality Association. It is being aided and abetted by other groups, including the National Associated Businessmen. Their latest move, Mr. Speaker, is the attempt which is now being made to stampede the resolution committees of the Democratic and Republican Parties for a proposed platform plank against farm cooperatives. They have undertaken a Nation-wide drive to obtain a million signatures in behalf of their mischievous program. A recent circular issued by the National Tax Equality Association illustrates the means they are using to obtain these signatures. It states in part as follows: "You will probably receive petitions sent out by other organizations. Use them. This is one case where duplication can be made to pay dividends—in more and more signatures." It looks like the National Tax Equality Association will be satisfied with all the petitions they can obtain even if some of them are duplicates. This should be ample warning to both major parties to scrutinize most carefully the petitions which will be presented to them.

Another tactic of the National Tax Equality Association is its attempt to smear the cooperatives as "Red" and "communistic." Nothing could be more ridiculous or further from the truth.

Farmer cooperatives are among the strongest foes of communism in any of its forms. Cooperatives are strongest in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and England, and in none of these countries has communism been able to gain the slightest foothold.

In the United States there are more than 5,000,000 members of farmers marketing and purchasing cooperatives, many farmers belonging to more than one association. Well over half of all the farmers in the United States are stanch members of cooperatives, and I have never heard of anyone but the National Tax Equality Association and its affiliates who has conceived that the American farmer was a Communist.

It is pertinent to inquire as to just who are these persons and these organizations who are spearheading the drive to strike at the very heart of the cooperative groups of farmers throughout the Nation. Who are these persons and organizations who would have the Republican and Democratic Parties repudiate the major contributions that farmer cooperatives have made in bringing health and prosperity to American agriculture and thereby to our whole Nation?

What are the selfish motives of those persons and individuals who would have us forget the prostrate condition of American agriculture only a few short years ago and the success of farmer cooperatives in making our system of free enterprise work on American farms?

The full story of the identity and financing of this giant anticooperative endeavor is not known to the public because of the conscious effort of its sponsors to obscure it. I do know that the parent organization organized in 1943 with the demonstrated objective of crushing the successful operation of farm cooperatives is the National Tax Equality Association, with headquarters in Chicago, Ill. I do know that Mr. Ben C. McCabe, chairman of the board and formerly president, attempted to hide the true nature of the NTEA when he told the House Ways and Means Committee on November 25, 1947, that:

> NTEA is devoted solely to research and educational activities and no deviation from these limitations is permitted either by the association's charter or by vote of its board of directors.

In order to try to retain its professed character of a research and educational organization, the NTEA has sponsored other organizations through which to channel to the public and to the Congress its propaganda advocating the overthrow of co-ops.

Up to about the first of this year, the NTEA had the United States Business Organizations, Inc., as its Washington agent to carry the frontal attack against

cooperatives. Karl S. Dixon, as executive vice president of the United States Business Organizations, was the $12,000-a-year man until a few months ago in Washington spearheading the drive against cooperatives. Now I understand Dixon is back in Chicago and, as vice president of the National Tax Equality Association, is taking an active part in contacting trade associations, chambers of commerce, business firms, and private individuals to get signatures to the anti-cooperative petition for presentation at the Republican and Democratic Conventions.

Is not this sufficient to indicate that NTEA has departed far from the research and educational activities professed by Mr. Ben McCabe?

Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, conducted extensive hearings during 1945 and 1946 on the subject of cooperatives. On page 42 of the report submitted to the Congress by the committee on April 9, 1946, we made the following findings and recommendations:

There is substantial evidence to show that the cooperative movement operates as a very successful means of combating monopolistic concentrations and, as such, is a very healthy addition to the American economy.

There is no evidence to show that cooperatives have been granted a type of preferential financial treatment by the Federal Government that has not likewise been made available to and accepted by other forms of business enterprise, including banks, savings and loan societies, manufacturers, distributors, and other types of private enterprise operating for the principal purpose of making profits. An examination of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other Federal financing agencies gives proof that thousands of private firms operating for profit have sought and enjoyed the benefits of such agencies' financial assistance in a manner comparable to that received by cooperatives from the Farm Credit Administration and its allied financing groups.

In 1947 the same committee conducted further hearings on this subject. During the course of these hearings, a request was made on August 22, 1947, by the gentleman from Texas, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, a member of the committee, for the National Tax Equality Association to submit a complete statement of its receipts, contributions, and disbursements for the past 2 years. The gentleman from Texas, Representative PATMAN, pointed out that certain cooperatives had been asked by the committee to submit their full records and that every one of them had fully complied with the request. Although this information was requested of the National Tax Equality Association, to date they have failed to submit to the committee any of the information called for in the hearings.

A recent estimate made after a survey of the records of the Clerk of the House of Representatives shows that almost a million dollars a year is being spent by the National Tax Equality Association and its affiliates. Yet we have no record of who is contributing these vast sums of money to destroy farmer cooperatives. I think that it is time we find out who is behind this campaign.

Farmers in my own district in Washington have grown tired of the baseless charges which have been leveled at them during the past 4 years by such organizations as the National Tax Equality Association and the National Associated Businessmen. Farmer cooperatives pay all the local, State, and Federal taxes which are paid by other businesses which operate in the same manner. Cooperatives pay property taxes, sales taxes, social-security taxes, stamp taxes, and income taxes if they make any profits. Members of farmer cooperatives pay a tax on every cent of income which comes to them from patronage refunds paid by their own associations. Cooperatives are taxed in exactly the same manner as are partnerships and individual businesses.

I would like to remind the leaders of both political parties that the farmers of this Nation will not stand by and permit the representatives of organized greed and wealth to deny them their right to organize and operate their own farm business enterprises. From the depths of economic depressions and personal hardships, the farmers of this Nation have built their own cooperative organizations to insure to themselves and their families the just financial returns from their toil and labors.

I am sure that the millions of farmers of this Nation will not allow a selfish few to destroy the cooperatives which farmers have struggled to build up over a quarter of a century.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we witness in the consideration of this bill the Congress legislating in accordance with the rules of both branches, and with the intent of Congress to get legislation enacted into law as quickly as possible. We have a situation here where a bill has passed the other body and the House committee has reported out a bill. If the House bill was brought up and passed, it would go over to the Senate, and we will have the situation of a bill passing the Senate over in the House and a bill passing the House over in the Senate, and no final action taken. In order to expedite legislative procedure and to get legislation enacted into law, where there is a sincere purpose to legislate, where a bill has passed one body and the other body has reported out a bill from the committee, the proper thing to do is to strike out all after the enacting clause and to substitute the bill of the body in which the bill is pending, in this case the Senate bill pending in the House, with the House passing the committee differences between the two bills. That means that there is complete legislative action to its final conclusion. When that is done the bill goes back to the Senate, and the Senate can agree to the House amendments insofar as there is a disagreement between the Senate bill and the bill as it passed this body. It goes back as a Senate bill with the House bill including all after the enacting clause. If the Senate decides not to concur, then they can ask for a conference, and after the conferees have discussed the matter, a conference report is brought in. If, in the first place, the Senate agrees to the House action, that is the end of it, and the bill, after engrossment and final action and signature by the presiding officers of both bodies, goes to the President. The same happens after a conference report is agreed to by both branches.

We are now witnessing the regular way of legislating, where there is a sincere desire to legislate. As to the housing bill, I am wondering if my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is going to take the same course. The housing bill will come up soon. There is a Senate bill now on the Speaker's table. I wonder if my good friend from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is going to, when he moves to suspend the rules, take the Senate bill and strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House bill, whichever one he is going to propose, and I assume it is the last bill he reported out.

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

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman should know, for the very simple reason that there is no Senate bill at the Speaker's table.

Mr. MCCORMACK. There is a Senate bill over here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is in committee.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is immaterial. It does not have to be on the Speaker's table. The bill has passed the other body. The Speaker could recognize to suspend the rules. It would not have to be reported out of committee. The bill is in committee, but it has passed the other body, so that is immaterial. The gentleman could move to suspend the rules and call up the Senate bill, and then strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House bill. That would be the orderly way, just as he is doing now. May I ask my friend from Michigan if it is the intention to do so?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is not the intention to do so.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That being so, it is not the intention of the Republicans, as far as the House is concerned, to have any real housing legislation enacted in this session of Congress, because if they did intend to do so, they would take up the Senate bill, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute the House bill, and then it would immediately go to conference. If they did that, then we would support it in order to get it into conference. The frank answer of my friend from Michigan is, again, what I said yesterday, a powerful message to the people of the country that everything that President Truman has been saying on his trip West about the Republican-controlled Congress is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that this bill is being brought up under suspension of rules which does not permit amendment. This is a very important measure. The Commodity

Credit Corporation furnishes the machinery through which the price-support programs on agricultural commodities are carried out. Without the Commodity Credit Corporation, it would be impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the mandate of Congress that prices on certain agricultural commodities be supported.

There are two very serious defects in the bill as it now stands. One of them is that the bill prohibits the Corporation from acquiring or leasing any plant or facility for warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, or from acquiring or leasing real property or any interest therein except the rental of office space. The bill also contains a provision reading as follows:

In the Corporation's leasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

These provisions which severely restrict the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation would, in my opinion, make it very difficult for the agency to carry out the duties imposed on it by law. However, I shall not detain the House with a detailed discussion of these points because my time is limited and this particular matter will be discussed by the able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] a little later in this debate.

The provisions of this bill to which I particularly wish to call attention and to discuss in some detail are those which provide for setting up the Board. Section 9 of the bill provides that the Board of Directors shall consist of five members, one of whom shall be the Secretary of Agriculture or his nominee, and the remaining four to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than one-half of the members of the Board could be employees of the Corporation or any Department or agency of the Government. The Secretary of Agriculture is divested of the authority which he has previously had, of general supervision of the Corporation.

This means that three members of the Board of Directors must be appointed from outside the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Government, and that the control of the operations of the Corporation would be in the hands of the appointed members. What would occur under those circumstances is that, while the Secretary of Agriculture would have the responsibility for carrying out the provisions of law relating to support prices, under the terms of this bill he would lack the authority to do so effectively. It would simply be another case of what we already have too much of in the Federal Government—that is divided authority. Under the arrangement provided in this bill the Board could, if it desired, adopt policies and carry out programs to which the Secretary was opposed. Congress and the President would have to look to both the Board of Directors of the Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the Congress does not give the Secretary of Agriculture full power over this board, how can we hold the Secretary of Agriculture to account for the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. HOPE. There is no way that we can do so.

The principal purpose in putting the Commodity Credit Corporation in the Department of Agriculture, where it has been since 1939, was to get away from the division of authority and to assure that the activities of the Department and those of the Commodity Credit Corporation which are so closely related, would be coordinated and integrated.

At present the officers of the Commodity Credit Corporation are officials of the Department of Agriculture who are also in charge of departmental programs relating to the production and marketing of agricultural commodities. The programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation are necessarily closely related to the others of the Department of Agriculture. They are tied in with programs which involve section 32 funds. Price supports are tied in closely with production goals. The programs of the Corporation at the State and county levels are carried on largely through committees of farmers who are also responsible for other departmental activities. If the Corporation were under the control of a separate Board which had no knowledge of these activities and no part in them, there would without question be a tremendous amount of overlapping and confusion, and there would always be the possibility of conflicting programs.

Another factor which, it seems to me, should be taken into consideration is that there is no way by which members of the Board appointed from outside the Department of Agriculture could devote full time to the affairs of the Corporation. I mean by that that there is no necessity for full-time directors to pass on the matters which would ordinarily come before the Board.

It would be expected, I presume, that the members of the Board would be men who were acquainted with and experienced in the buying and selling of agricultural products. There is nothing in the bill which requires that they divest themselves of outside interests in those activities before becoming members of the Board. I believe that most men who are qualified for a position on the Board would not feel that they could afford to divest themselves of conflicting private interests. If they did not do so, they and the Board would certainly be subject to criticism. Thus, in practical operation, it would probably turn out that members of the Board will be those with conflicting private interests or persons without adequate experience to conduct such important business activities.

The provisions of this bill to which I have alluded are matters of deep concern to farmers everywhere. Some of our leading farm organizations have gone on record as being greatly disturbed by the provisions now contained in this bill. I have here in my hand a letter from Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, reading as follows:

JUNE 15, 1948.

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: We sincerely hope the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be amended to eliminate the divided responsibility under which the Secretary is charged with the duty for supporting commodity prices, but with means for carrying out this duty under the control of a board not responsible to him. We believe that the bill should also be amended to eliminate those sections which would channel all operations through the grain trade who might easily wreck the Corporation's essential stabilization operations or make them prohibitively expensive.

Sincerely yours,

A. S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.

I also have the following telegram from Mr. John J. Riggle, assistant secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives:

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives:

Urge that H. R. 6263, Commodity Credit Corporation bill, be amended to eliminate divided authority between Secretary of Agriculture to support farm prices and handle surplus and the independent Board to direct affairs of Corporation, and to provide for Corporation to own real and personal property necessary to handle surpluses of farm products which normal channels of trade do not handle at or above support levels.

JOHN J. RIGGLE,
Assistant Secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has stated its position in the following wire, signed by Roger W. Fleming, director of its Washington office:

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE:
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge support amendment to H. R. 6263, Federal charter CCC, eliminating restrictive grain-trade provisions, and substituting language requiring CCC, in buying, selling, and other operations, to use normal trade channels insofar as practicable. Because of congressional mandates on loans, price support and other operations control of Corporation should be left with Secretary of Agriculture.

ROGER W. FLEMING,
Director, Washington Office, American Farm Bureau Federation.

If this bill had been brought up under such circumstances that amendments were permitted, I would offer the following amendments, which, if adopted, would cure the serious defects to which I have referred:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "its Board of Directors" and insert in lieu thereof "the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as 'Secretary')."

Page 8, line 12, strike out section 9 in its entirety and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. Directors: (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary, who shall be a director and serve as Chairman of the Board. The

Board shall consist of four members (in addition to the Secretary), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum and shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that (i) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 1 year, and one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, and one at the end of 4 years, after the date of enactment of this act. In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum, except that any such member who holds another office or position under the Department of Agriculture, the compensation for which exceeds such rate, may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section.

"(b) Vacancies in the Board, whether arising from failure of the President to nominate or the Senate to confirm the original or subsequent members of the Board, so long as there shall be four members in office, shall not impair the powers of the Board to execute the functions of the Corporation, and a majority of the members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the Board."

Page 9, line 13, strike out section 10 in its entirety and substitute the following:

"SEC. 10. Personnel of Corporation: The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine, require that such of them as he may designate be bonded, and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 661)."

Since it is not possible under this procedure to offer amendments, I have inserted them in the RECORD, with the hope that when this bill goes to conference, the conferees may agree upon provisions which are substantially the same as those contained in the amendments above-quoted.

As indicated in the beginning of my remarks, I regard this matter as one of the greatest importance to the agricultural producers of this country.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. Because of the unusual parliamentary situation, has the gentleman from Kansas any information as to how these matters may be handled in conference if this bill is passed by this body?

Mr HOPE. We have a Senate bill, and I understand that the Senate bill will be substituted for this bill, and that everything after the enacting clause will be stricken out of the Senate bill, and the subject matter of the House bill inserted. That would get the bill into conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired,

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree 100 percent with what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] had to say about the divided authority which is created by the provisions of this particular bill. Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, regardless of who is Secretary of Agriculture, if we in Congress want to hold that official responsible for Commodity Credits operations, we must give to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to make decisions. I sincerely trust, as Mr. Hope has stated, that this subject will be considered in confidence.

There is another defect in this particular bill. If you will turn to Section 5 of H. R. 6263, you will see a mandatory provision there in which it is required that practically all operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in regard to the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities shall utilize—note the word "shall"—the customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

What does that amendment mean? May I say first that the gentleman from Michigan has very kindly agreed that an amendment will be placed in this particular paragraph after the word "shall", which will not make this particular section mandatory. But under this particular section if left in the bill as it is, the Commodity Credit Corporation alone with other things could not purchase commodities directly from producers. It could not sell commodities directly to farmers. It could not extend the price support to farmers through purchases in areas where dealers are not willing to participate in the program. Frankly it would render ineffective entirely the great sealing program that we have had in effect throughout the Middle West in corn especially and other grains.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan and the committee for their willingness to accept this amendment, which will not make this section workable.

I am also disturbed about page 24, line 22. The language as written there practically says to the Commodity Credit Corporation: "You cannot utilize the 22,000 or more small steel-grain bins which you have had as extra storage space. We can plainly see that in case of a glut on the railroads or in the terminal markets the present language would mean that it would be practically impossible to carry out a grain-sealing program. Here, again, I am glad that the gentleman has agreed to an amendment, which does not go as far as I would like to see it, but nevertheless it does help a great deal. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has been very helpful in getting the matter adjusted.

Will the gentleman state what, in his opinion, his particular amendment to that section on page 4, line 22, would do? Would it assure the right of the Commodity Credit Corporation to own personal property? There is no such definite assurance in the bill. I would like a definite assurance that the Corporation can own these 20,000, or more, steel tanks, if needed, to carry out its functions as the vehicle for price-support programs.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I am in a position to assure the gentleman—surely, I would state it is my understanding—that there is no limitation upon the amount of personal property which the Corporation may own. There is a limitation which applies only to leases and real estate, and, as the gentleman says, they will be authorized under this amendment to continue existing leases.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, this is another measure to guarantee continued high prices and high cost of living.

I read two of the specific powers granted the Corporation as set forth on page 6 (a): "Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations." Then, having bought the commodities, subsection (d) permits the Corporation to "remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities." It buys the commodities in section (a), and pours kerosene on them in section (d).

Members who want a continuation of the high cost of living should vote in favor of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1322, as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 107, noes 13.

So two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING ACT OF 1948

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Housing Act of 1948."

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 101. (a) Section 1 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "titles II, III, and VI" wherever appearing in said section and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, VI, and VII."

(b) Section 2 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended:

(1) by striking out "$165,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000,000";

(2) by striking out "$3,000" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,500";

(3) by striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided,* That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure in order to provide additional housing accommodations for two or more families:".

(4) by amending the last sentence of subsection (b) to read as follows: "The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to veterans of World War II and their immediate families occupancy priority with respect to any additional housing accommodations referred to in the first proviso of this subsection."

(c) Section 5 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The Administrator shall make an annual report to the Congress not later than the 1st day of April in each year of his activities during the preceding calendar year under this title and titles II, III, VI, and VII of this act."

TITLE II—DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED PERMANENT WAR-HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

(2) The term "Lanham War Housing Act" means the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

(3) The term "war housing" means any interest, owned by the United States and under the control of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in (A) housing (other than temporary housing) acquired or constructed under the Lanham War Housing Act, under the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public, No. 781, 76th Cong.), as amended, under the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public Law 9, 77th Cong.), or under the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 375, 78th Cong.), and (B) such other property as is determined by the Administrator to be essential to the use of such housing.

(4) The term "veteran" means (A) any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, or (B), during the present war, any person in the active military or naval service of the United States.

(5) The term "dwelling" means a war-housing building designed for residential use of one or more families.

(6) The term "dwelling unit" means a dwelling, or that part of a dwelling, which is designed for residential use of one family.

SALE OF WAR HOUSING

SEC. 202. (a) All war housing (except mortgages, liens, or other interests as security) shall, subject to the provisions of this title, be sold for cash as expeditiously as possible and not later than December 31, 1949. Wherever practicable each dwelling in a war housing project shall be offered for sale separately from other dwellings in such project. Any mortgage, lien, or other interest in war housing held by the Administrator or acquired by him pursuant to a contract entered into prior to February 26, 1947, may, subject to the provisions of this section, be sold for cash.

(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the price to be paid for war housing sold under this title shall be a price not less than the reasonable value thereof at the time of the offer for sale as determined by appraisal made by an appraiser or appraisers designated by the Federal Housing Commissioner.

(2) The price to be paid for any mortgage, lien, or other interest as security sold under this section shall be a price not less than the unpaid principal (plus accrued interest thereon) of the obligation with respect to which the mortgage, lien, or other interest as security is held.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (a) and (b), the sale of war housing under this title shall be with or without warranty and upon such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems proper.

TRANSFER OF WAR HOUSING TO THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 203. Notwithstanding the provisions of this title or any other provision of law, the Administrator may, in his discretion, transfer to the jurisdiction of the appropriate department in the National Military Establishment any war housing situated within the proximate vicinity of any permanent Army, Navy, or Air Force Establishment if the transfer of such war housing was requested on or before April 15, 1947, by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

PREFERENCES

SEC. 204. (a) Preference in the purchase of any dwelling designed for occupancy by less than five families shall be granted to veterans and their families and to occupants over other prospective purchasers of such dwelling in the following order:

(1) A veteran and his family who occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold.

(2) A veteran and his family who do not occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold but who intend to occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be purchased; but if the dwelling is designed for occupancy by two, three, or four families, equal preference shall be granted to a private corporation, association, or cooperative society which is the legal agent of veterans and their families who intend to occupy the dwelling purchased by such corporation, associations, or society.

(3) A nonveteran who occupies a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold.

(b) In the case of any war housing project where it is not practicable to offer each dwelling for sale separately from other dwellings in the project and in the case of any dwelling designed for occupancy by more than four families, preference in the purchase thereof shall be granted to any private corporation, association, or cooperative society which is the legal agent of veterans who intend to occupy the war housing purchased by such corporation, association, or society.

(c) The Administrator shall give such notice in such manner as he deems reasonable to enable prospective purchasers who have a preference under this section in the purchase of war housing to exercise such preference. Any prospective purchaser having a preference under subsection (a) in the purchase of any dwelling may apply for the purchase of such dwelling (1) if the preference is under paragraph (1), within 30 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale, (2) if the preference is under paragraph (2), within 60 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale, and (3) if the preference is under paragraph (3), within 90 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale. Any corporation, association, or society having a preference under subsection (b) in the purchase of any war housing may apply for the purchase of such housing within 180 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale.

SALES WITHOUT PREFERENCE

SEC. 205. If any dwelling or war housing project is not sold to a purchaser who is granted a preference under section 204 and who applied within the time prescribed in subsection (c) of such section, such dwelling or war housing project shall be sold as provided in this title without regard to any preferences granted under section 204 and without regard to any restrictions contained in any other law as to whom war housing may be sold.

TITLE OF PURCHASER

SEC. 206. A deed or other instrument executed by or on behalf of the Administrator purporting to transfer title or any other interest in property under this title shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with the provisions of this title insofar as title or other interest of any bona fide purchasers for value is concerned.

VALIDITY OF CONTRACTS

SEC. 207. Nothing in this title shall be deemed to impair or modify any contract entered into prior to February 26, 1947, for the sale of property, or any term or provision of any such contract, without the consent of the purchaser or his assignee, if the contract or the term or provision thereof is otherwise valid.

DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS

SEC. 208. Moneys derived by the Administrator from the disposition of war housing under this title shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 301. Title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"CREATION AND POWERS OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"SEC. 301. (a) The Administrator is further authorized and empowered to provide for the establishment of a Federal National Mortgage Association (hereinafter referred to as the 'association') which shall be authorized, subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Association—

"(1) to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, which are insured after June 19, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended: *Provided, however,* That—

"(A) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by Federal, State, or municipal instrumentalities;

"(B) no mortgage may be purchased for an amount exceeding 98 percent of the unpaid principal balance thereof, plus accrued interest, at the time of purchase;

"(C) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase if the original principal obligation of the loan exceeds or exceeded $10,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage or other lien securing the loan;

"(D) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase unless offered by the original mortgagee prior to any other sale thereof;

"(E) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by any one mortgagee (1) if dated prior to June 19, 1948, and (2) if the unpaid principal balance thereof, when added to the aggregate amount paid for all such mortgages purchased by the Association from such mortgagee, exceeds 25 percent of the original principal amount of all such mortgage loans made by such mortgagee after June 19, 1948.

"(2) to borrow money for any of the foregoing purposes through the issuance of notes or other such obligations as hereinafter provided.

"(b) the Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and established pursuant to the provisions of this title as in effect prior to June 1, 1948, shall be the Association referred to in subsection (a) of this section. The Board of Directors of the Association shall consist of not less than five persons to be appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the Acting Chairman in the case of a vacancy in the office of Chairman, from the Directors, officers, or employees of such Corporation, and the officers shall be appointed by the Board of Directors from the Directors, officers, or employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(c) The Association created under this section shall have succession from the date of its organization unless it is dissolved by order of the Administrator as hereinafter provided, or by act of Congress, and shall have power—

"(1) to adopt and use a corporate seal;

"(2) to make contracts;

"(3) to sue and be sued; complain and defend, in any court of law or equity, State or Federal;

"(4) to conduct its business in any State of the United States, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, and to have one or more offices in such State, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, one of which offices shall be designated at the time of organization as its principal office;

"(5) to do all things as are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business.

"(d) The Association shall have a capital stock of $20,000,000 and paid-in surplus of $1,000,000, subscribed in full by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(e) The Association, for the purpose of al. actions by or against it, real, personal, or mixed, and all suits in equity, shall be deemed a citizen of the place in which its principal office is located.

"(f) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation, except the Association organized under this section, shall hereafter use the words 'Federal National Mortgage Association' or any combination of such words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $100 or imprisonment not exceeding 30 days, or both, for each day during which such violation is committed or repeated. The provisions of section 5243 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the Association created under this title.

"OBLIGATIONS

"SEC. 302. The Association is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any time notes or other obligations in an aggregate amount not to exceed (1) 40 times the amount of its capital and surplus, and in no event to exceed (2) the current unpaid principal of mortgages held by it and insured under the provisions of titles II and VI of this act and guaranteed under section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, plus the amount of its cash on hand and on deposit and the amortized value of its investments in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

"SEC. 303. Moneys of the Association not invested in first mortgages or in operating facilities shall be kept in cash on hand or on deposit, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States; except that the Association shall keep and maintain such reserves as it may deem necessary.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 304. The Association, including its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, mortgage loans, income, and stock, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Association shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

"MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

"SEC. 305. The Association shall have power to deal with, rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash, with a view to assuring a maximum financial return to the Association, any property acquired by it as a result of foreclosure proceedings or otherwise.

"LIQUIDATION

"SEC. 306. The Administrator shall have power to terminate the existence of the Association and order its liquidation and the winding up of its affairs whenever the Administrator determines, in his judgment, that the need therefor no longer exists. The Association shall make a report of its activities to the Administrator in January .nd July of each year for the preceding 6 months' period, which report shall be transmitted to the Congress, together with the Administrator's recommendations thereon."

SEC. 302. Nothing in the amendment made by section 301 of this act shall limit the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to service or sell any mortgage purchased prior to the date of the enactment of this act, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgage with respect to which a commitment to purchase was made prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

TITLE IV—TAX INCENTIVE FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL RENTAL HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS

SEC. 401. (a) The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 124 thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 124A. Amortization Deduction for Rental Housing.

"(a) General rule: Every taxpayer, at his election, shall be entitled to an amorization deduction for a period of 60 months with respect to any necessary rental housing facility defined in subsection (d). Such amortization deduction shall be an amount, with respect to each month of such period within the taxable year, equal to the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of the facility at the end of such month divided by 60 plus the number of months (including the month for which the deduction is computed) remaining in the 60-month period. Such adjusted basis at the end of the month shall be computed without regard to the amortization deduction for such month. The amortization deduction above provided with respect to any month shall be in lieu of the deduction with respect to such facility for such month provided by section 23 (l) (relating to exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence), but shall be allowable only if a deduction under section 23 (l) would otherwise be allowable for such month with respect to such facility. The amortization deduction shall be allowable only to the taxpayer to whom a certificate is issued under subsection (e) with respect to such facility; and, if such certificate is revoked by the Federal Housing Commissioner for any violation of the conditions and specifications contained therein, the deduction shall not be allowable for any month ending after a violation upon which such revocation is based. The 60-month period shall begin as to any such facility at the election of the taxpayer, with the month following the month in which the facility was completed, or with the succeeding taxable year.

"(b) Election of amortization: The election of the taxpayer to take the amortization deductions and to begin the 60-month period with the month following the month in which the facility was completed shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for the taxable year in which the facility was completed. The election to take the amortization deduction and to begin such period with the taxable year succeeding such year shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for such succeeding taxable year.

"(c) Termination of amortization deduction: A taxpayer which has elected under subsection (b) to take the amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) may, at any time after making such election, discontinue the amortization deductions with respect to the remainder of the amortization period, such discontinuance to begin as of the beginning of any month specified by the taxpayer in a notice in writing filed with the Commissioner before the beginning of such month. The deduction provided under section 23 (l) shall be allowed, beginning with the first month as to which the amortization deduction is not applicable, and the taxpayer shall not be entitled to any further amortization deductions with respect to such facility.

"(d) Definitions: As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'necessary rental housing facility' means any rental housing facility with respect to which a certificate under subsection (e) is issued to the taxpayer.

"(2) The term 'rental housing facility' means—

"(A) any dwelling unit or units held by the taxpayer for rental purposes, the construction of which is begun at any time on or after July 1, 1948, and before the close of July 1, 1950; or

"(B) any dwelling unit or units held by the taxpayer for rental purposes provided by the alteration or remodeling of an existing structure if such alteration or remodeling is begun at any time on or after July 1, 1948, and before the close of July 1, 1950, and if such dwelling unit or units are in addition to the number of dwelling units contained in such structure prior to such alteration or remodeling.

"(3) The term 'dwelling unit' means any dwelling unit containing its own kitchen and bath facilities.

"(4) The adjusted basis of any necessary rental housing facility shall include only so much of the amount otherwise constituting such adjusted basis as is properly attributable to the construction, or to the alteration or remodeling, covered in the certificate issued under subsection (e). In no event shall the basis of the land on which such facility is located be included in such adjusted basis.

"(e) Issuance of certificate: (1) The Federal Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized to certify as necessary any rental housing facility (A) which is or will be located in an area in which he finds there is a shortage of rental housing and (B) in which the dwelling units are or will be of such character and will be rented at such rentals as will, in his judgment, tend to relieve such shortage. Such Commissioner is authorized, upon any violation of the conditions and specifications contained in a certificate issued by him, to revoke such certificate.

"(2) An application for such certificate shall be filed with the Federal Housing Commissioner prior to the commencement of the construction, or alteration or remodeling, of the rental housing facility, and such certificate shall be issued only to the person filing such application.

"(3) The Federal Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized, from time to time, to prescribe forms and regulations with respect to such certificates.

"(f) Life tenant and remainderman: In the case of property held by one person for life with remainder to another person, the deduction shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowable to the life tenant."

(b) Section 23 (t) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(t) Amortization deduction: The deduction for amortization provided in sections 124 and 124A."

(c) Section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out "of emergency facilities."

(d) Section 190 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "emergency facilities" the following: "or necessary rental housing facilities."

(e) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 2. Section 3403 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The tax imposed by subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of trailer coaches of the housing type (including parts or accessories therefor sold on or in connection therewith or with the sale thereof) sold prior to July 1, 1950, and after the close of the month in which falls the date of the enactment of this subsection."

TITLE V—GI HOME LOAN INCONTESTABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 501. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 510 thereof the following new section:

"INCONTESTABILITY

"SEC. 511. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and of the amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against the original lender, defenses based on fraud or material misrepresentation, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, by regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, partial defenses to the amount payable on the guaranty or insurance."

TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 601. (a) Section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,950,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,950,000,000";

(2) by striking out "April 30, 1948" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1949";

(3) by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding a comma and the following: "and that, of the total authorization provided in this subsection, not less than $800,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on rental properties under section 608, and not less than $200,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on multifamily dwellings under section 603, on which commitments for insurance are issued subsequent to March 31, 1948."

(b) Section 603 (b) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting "unless insured under paragraph (2a) of this subsection," before "involve" in paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(2a) if insured under this paragraph, involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Administrator shall approve) in an amount not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 95 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance, of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That mortgages shall be insured under this paragraph only if the Administrator determines that such insurance of mortgages would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 where he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property in cash or its equivalent, at least 5 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the value of the property, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the value of the property;".

(c) Section 603 (b) (3) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) of this subsection or not to exceed 30 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2a) of this subsection".

(d) Section 603 (b) (5) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(5) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any one time, or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it."

(e) Section 603 (c) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out in the next to the last sentence the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

SEC. 602. Section 604 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: "*Provided further*, That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 603 (b) (2a) or under the third proviso of section 608 (b) (3) (B) there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator, on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Administrator, an amount not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75, whichever is the greater:".

SEC. 603. (a) Section 608 (b) (3) (B) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That the principal obligation of the mortgage shall not, in any event, exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located: *And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph (B), a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members, may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed and not exceeding 95 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the project on the basis of the cost prevailing on December 31, 1947, for projects of comparable quality in the locality where such project is to be located; and".

(b) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(C) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use: *Provided*, That the Administrator may increase this amount to $9,100 where in his discretion cost levels so require."

(c) The next to the last sentence of section 608 (b) (3) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The mortgage shall provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe, and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it."

SEC. 604. Section 609 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended:

(a) By striking out all of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding purchase contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator providing for the purchase and delivery of the houses to be manufactured, which contracts shall provide for the payment of the purchase price at such time as may be agreed to by the parties thereto, but in no event, shall the purchase price be payable on a date in excess of 30 days after the date of delivery of such houses, unless not less than 20 percent of such purchase price is paid on or before the date of delivery and the lender has accepted and discounted, or has agreed to accept and discount, pursuant to subsection (i) of this section a promissory note or notes, executed by the purchaser, representing the unpaid portion of such purchase price, in which event such unpaid portion of the purchase price may be payable on a date not in excess of 180 days from the date of delivery of such houses."

(b) By striking out all of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost, exclusive of profit, of manufacturing the houses, which are the subject of such purchase contracts assigned to secure the loans, less any sums paid by the purchaser under said purchase contracts prior to the assignment thereof. The loan shall be secured by an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts and of all sums

payable thereunder on or after the date of such assignment, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses then owned and in the possession of the borrower. The loan shall have a maturity not in excess of 1 year from the date of the note, except that any such loan may be refinanced and extended in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe for an additional term not to exceed 1 year, and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum (or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that special circumstances demand it) on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time."

(c) By adding at the end of subsection (f) the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 603 (d) shall also be applicable to loans insured under this section and the reference in said section 603 (d) to a mortgage shall be construed to include a loan or loans with respect to which a contract of insurance is issued pursuant to this section."

(d) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(i) (1) In addition to the insurance of the principal loan to finance the manufacture of housing, as provided in this section, and in order to provide short term financing in the sale of houses to be delivered pursuant to the purchase contract or contracts assigned as security for such principal loan, the Administrator is authorized, under such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe, to insure the lender against any losses it may sustain resulting from the acceptance and discount of a promissory note or notes executed by a purchaser of any such houses representing an unpaid portion of the purchase price of any such houses. No such promissory note or notes accepted and discounted by the lender pursuant to this subsection shall involve a principal obligation in excess of 80 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses; have a maturity in excess of 180 days from the date of the note or bear interest in excess of 4 percent per annum (or in excess of 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that special circumstances demand it); nor may the principal amount of such promissory notes, with respect to any individual principal loan, outstanding and unpaid at any one time exceed in the aggregate an amount prescribed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to include in any contract of insurance executed by him with respect to the insurance of a loan to finance the manufacture of houses, provisions to effectuate the insurance against any such losses under this subsection.

"(3) The failure of the purchaser to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or notes executed by the purchaser and accepted and discounted by the lender under the provisions of this subsection shall be considered as a default under this subsection, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance, as provided in subsection (d) of this section except that debentures issued pursuant to this subsection shall have a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of default to the date the application is filed for the insurance benefits.

"(4) Debentures issued with respect to the insurance granted under this subsection shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date application is filed for the insurance benefits and shall bear interest from such date.

"(5) The Administrator is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this subsection, in addition to the premium charge authorized under section (h) of this section, such premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such promissory note or notes and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(j) To further carry out the purposes referred to in subsection (a) the Administrator is authorized to insure loans to finance the manufacture of housing equipment used on the job site in the actual construction of housing (including advances on such loans) in the same manner and under the same conditions applicable with respect to loans eligible for insurance under subsection (b): *Provided*, That to the extent the proceeds of the loan are used for the purchase of equipment, plant, or machinery the principal obligation shall not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of such equipment, plant, or machinery.

"The other provisions of this section insofar as they are applicable shall apply in like respect and effect to loans insured under this subsection."

SEC. 605. Section 610 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Administrator is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any of the so-called Greenbelt towns, including projects known as Greenhills, Ohio, Greenbelt, Md., and Greendale, Wis., developed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, and any mortgage executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government, of any portion of a project or property which is the security for a mortgage insured pursuant to the provisions of this section."

SEC. 606. Title VI of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost reduction techniques through large-scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than twenty-five families consisting of a group of single-family or two-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve; and

"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon, and

"(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project as follows:

"(i) $8,100 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling, and

"(ii) $12,500 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each two-family dwelling.

"With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof; and

"(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

TITLE VII—EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

SEC. 701. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE VII—INSURANCE FOR INVESTMENTS IN RENTAL HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 701. The purpose of this title is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing under this Act by a special system for insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate income. To effectuate this purpose, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the investor, to insure as hereinafter provided, and, prior to the execution of insurance contracts, and upon such terms as the Administrator shall prescribe, to make commitments to insure, the minimum annual amortization charge and an annual return on the outstanding investment of such investor in any project which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided in an amount (herein called the 'insured annual return') equal to such rate of return, not exceeding 2¾ percent per annum, on such outstanding investment as shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, be fixed in the insurance contract or in the commitment to insure: *Provided*, That any insurance contract made pursuant to this title shall expire as of the first day of the operating year for which the outstanding investment amounts to not more than 10 percent of the established investment: *And provided further*, That the aggregate

amount of contingent liabilities outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed $1,000,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible for insurance under this title, a project shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The Administrator shall be satisfied that there is, in the locality or metropolitan area of such project, a need for new rental dwellings at rents comparable to the rents proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project.

"(2) Such project shall be economically sound, and the dwellings in such project shall be acceptable to the Administrator as to quality, design, size, and type.

"(b) Any insurance contract executed by the Administrator under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the project and the investor for such insurance, and the validity of any insurance contract so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an investor from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such investor.

"PREMIUMS AND FEES

"SEC. 703. (a) For insurance granted pursuant to this title the Administrator shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not exceeding one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge is payable without taking into account the excess earnings, if any, applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the investor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Administrator under this title at par plus accrued interest: *Provided*, That, if in any operating year the gross income shall be less than the operating expenses, the premium charge payable during such operating year shall be waived, but only to the extent of the amount of the difference between such expenses and such income and subject to subsequent payment out of any excess earnings as hereinafter provided.

"(b) With respect to any project offered for insurance under this title, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect reasonable fees for examination, and for inspection during the construction of the project: *Provided*, That such fees shall not aggregate more than one-half of 1 percent of the estimated investment.

"RENTS

"SEC. 704. The Administrator shall require that the rents for the dwellings in any project insured under this title shall be established in accordance with a rent schedule approved by the Administrator, and that the investor shall not charge or collect rents for any dwellings in the project in excess of the appropriate rents therefor as shown in the latest rent schedule approved pursuant to this section. Prior to approving the initial or any subsequent rent schedule pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall find that such schedule affords reasonable assurance that the rents to be established thereunder are (1) not lower than necessary, together with all other income to be derived from or in connection with the project, to produce reasonably stable revenues sufficient to provide for the payment of the operating expenses, the minimum annual amortization charge, and the minimum annual return; and (2) not higher than necessary to meet the need for dwellings for families of moderate income.

"EXCESS EARNINGS

"SEC. 705. For all of the purposes of any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, 50 percent of the excess earnings, if any, for any operating year may be applied, in addition to the minimum annual return, to return on the outstanding investment but only to the extent that such application thereof does not result in an annual return of more than 5 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year, and the balance of any such excess earnings shall be applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment: *Provided*, That if in any preceding operating years the gross income shall have been less than the operating expenses, such excess earnings shall be applied to the extent necessary, in whole or in part, first, to the reimbursement of the amount of the difference between such expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and such income, and, second, to the payment of any premium charges previously waived hereunder.

"FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

"SEC. 706. With respect to each project insured under this title, the Administrator shall provide that, after the close of each operating year, the investor shall submit to him for approval a financial and operating statement covering such operating year. If any such financial and operating statement shall not have been submitted or, for proper cause, shall not have been approved by the Administrator, payment of any claim submitted by the investor may, at the option of the Administrator, be withheld, in whole or in part, until such statement shall have been submitted and approved.

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

"SEC. 707. If in any operating year the net income of a project insured under this title is less than the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return, the Administrator, upon submission by the investor of a claim for the payment of the amount of the difference between such net income and the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return and after proof of the validity of such claim, shall pay to the investor, in cash from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, the amount of such difference, as determined by the Administrator, but not exceeding, in any event, an amount equal to the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 708. (a) If the aggregate of the amounts paid to the investor pursuant to section 707 hereof with respect to a project insured under this title shall at any time equal or exceed 15 percent of the established investment, the Administrator thereafter shall have the right, after written notice to the investor of his intention so to do, to acquire, as of the first day of any operating year, such project in consideration of the issuance and delivery to the investor of debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year. In any such case the investor shall be obligated to convey to said Administrator title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and, in the event that the investor fails so to do, said Administrator may, at his option, terminate the insurance contract.

"(b) If in any operating year the aggregate of the differences between the operating expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and the gross income for the preceding operating years, less the aggregate of any deficits in such operating expenses reimbursed from excess earnings as hereinbefore provided, shall at any time equal or exceed 5 percent of the established investment, the investor shall thereafter have the right, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, to convey to the Administrator, as of the first day of any operating year, title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and to receive from the Administrator debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(c) Any difference, not exceeding $50, between 90 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year in which a project is acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this section and the total face value of the debentures to be issued and delivered to the investor pursuant to this section shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Administrator to the investor from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund.

"(d) Upon the acquisition of a project by the Administrator pursuant to this section, the insurance contract shall terminate.

"(e) Debentures issued under this title to any investor shall be executed in the name of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Administrator, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall be dated as of the first day of the operating year in which the project for which such debentures were issued was acquired by the Administrator, shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the insurance contract was executed, but not to exceed 2¾ percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year and shall mature on the 1st day of July in such calendar year or years, not later than the fortieth following the date of the issuance thereof, as shall be determined by the Administrator and stated on the face of such debentures.

"(f) Such debentures shall be in such form and in such denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and may include such provisions for redemption as shall be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be issued in either coupon or registered form.

"(g) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, shall be payable out of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed, as to both the principal thereof and the interest thereon, by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Housing Investment Insurance Fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or the interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real and other property by the Unitd States, the Administrator shall have power, for the protection of the

Housing Investment Insurance Fund, to pay out of said Fund all expenses or charges in connection with, and to deal with, complete, reconstruct, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title; and, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired by, or assigned or transferred to, him in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any project pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any project acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such purchase or contract does not exceed $1,000.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 709. The investor, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, may terminate, as of the close of any operating year, any insurance contract made pursuant to this title. The Administrator shall prescribe the events and conditions under which said Administrator shall have the option to terminate any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, and the events and conditions under which said Administrator may reinstate any insurance contract terminated pursuant to this section or section 708 (a). If any insurance contract is terminated pursuant to this section, the Administrator may require the investor to pay an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Administrator determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges which such investor otherwise would have been required to pay if such insurance contract had not been so terminated.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 710. There is hereby created a Housing Investment Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Administrator as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. For this purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Administrator such funds as the Administrator shall deem necessary, but not to exceed $10,000,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, inspection and other fees, service charges, and any other income received by the Administrator under this title, together with all earnings on the assets of such Housing Investment Insurance Fund, shall be credited to said fund. All payments made pursuant to claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, cash adjustments, the principal of and interest on debentures issued under this title, expenses incurred in connection with or as a consequence of the acquisition and disposal of projects acquired under this title, and all administrative expenses in connection with this title, shall be paid from said fund. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all approved claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, and, in the event said fund fails to make any such payment when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the investor the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Moneys in the Housing Investment Insurance Fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of said fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Administrator may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 711. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 712. The Administrator may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limiting the foregoing, rules and regulations relating to the maintenance by the investor of books, records, and accounts with respect to the project and the examination of such books, records, and accounts by representatives of the Administrator; the submission of financial and operating statements and the approval thereof; the submission of claims for payments under insurance contracts, the proof of the validity of such claims, and the payment or disallowance thereof; the increase of the established investment if the investor shall make capital improvements or additions to the project; the decrease of the established investment if the investor shall sell part of the project; and the reduction of the outstanding investment for the appropriate operating year or operating years pending the restoration of dwelling or nondwelling facilities damaged by fire or other casualty. With respect to any investor which is subject to supervision or regulation by a State banking, insurance, or other State department or agency, the Administrator may, in carrying out any of his supervisory and regulatory functions with respect to projects insured under this title, utilize, contract with, and act through such department or agency and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 713. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Investor' shall mean (1) any natural person; (2) any group of not more than 10 natural persons; (3) any corporation, company, association, trust, or other legal entity; or (4) any combination of two or more corporations, companies, associations, trusts, or other legal entities, having all the powers necessary to comply with the requirements of this title, which the Administrator (i) shall find to be qualified by business experience and facilities, to afford assurance of the necessary continuity of long-term investment, and to have available the necessary capital required for long-term investment in the project, and (ii) shall approve as eligible for insurance under this title.

"(b) 'Project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by the investor in connection therewith) of an investor, designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwellings the occupancy of which is permitted by the investor in consideration of agreed charges: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or desirable appurtenances to such project.

"(c) 'Estimated investment' shall mean the estimated cost of the development of the project, as stated in the application submitted to the Administrator for insurance under this title.

"(d) 'Established investment' shall mean the amount of the reasonable costs, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a project and shall include the premium charge for the first operating year and the cost of all necessary surveys, plans and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction, and equipment; a reasonable return on the funds of the investor paid out in course of the development of the project, up to and including the initial occupancy date; necessary expenses in connection with the initial occupancy of the project; and the cost of such other items as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the development of the project, (1) less the amount by which the rents and revenues derived from the project up to and including the initial occupancy date exceeded the reasonable and proper expenses, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, operating and maintaining said project up to and including the initial occupancy date, or (2) plus the amount by which such expenses exceeded such rents and revenues, as the case may be.

"(e) 'Physical completion date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which the Administrator determines that the construction of the project is substantially completed and substantially all of the dwellings therein are available for occupancy.

"(f) 'Initial occupancy date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which 90 percent in number of the dwellings in the project on the physical completion date shall have been occupied, but shall in no event be later than the last day of the sixth calendar month next following the physical completion date.

"(g) 'Operating year' shall mean the period of twelve consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date and each succeeding period of twelve consecutive calendar months, and the period of the first twelve consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date shall be the first operating year.

"(h) 'Gross income' for any operating year shall mean the total rents and revenues and other income derived from, or in connection with, the project during such operating year.

"(i) 'Operating expenses' for any operating year shall mean the amounts, as approved by the Administrator, necessary to meet the reasonable and proper costs of, and to provide for, operating and maintaining the project, and to establish and maintain reasonable and proper reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements, and other necessary reserves during such operating year, and shall include necessary expenses for real-estate taxes, special assessments, premium charges made pursuant to this title, administrative expenses, the annual rental under any lease pursuant to which the real property comprising the site of the project is held by the investor, and insurance charges, together with such other expenses as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the project, but shall not include income taxes.

"(j) 'Net income' for any operating year shall mean gross income remaining after the payment of the operating expenses.

"(k) 'Minimum annual amortization charge' shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment, except that, in the case of a project where the real

property comprising the site thereof is held by the investor under a lease, if (notwithstanding the proviso of section 703 (a) hereof) the gross income for any operating year shall be less than the amount required to pay the operating expenses (including the annual rental under such lease), the minimum annual amortization charge for such operating year shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment plus the amount of the annual rental under such lease to the extent that the same is not paid from the gross income.

"(l) 'Annual return' for any operating year shall mean the net income remaining after the payment of the minimum annual amortization charge.

"(m) 'Insured annual return' shall have the meaning ascribed to it in section 701 hereof.

"(n) 'Minimum annual return' for any operating year shall mean an amount equal to 3½ percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(o) 'Excess earnings' for any operating year shall mean the net income derived from a project in excess of the minimum annual amortization charge and the minimum annual return.

"(p) 'Outstanding investment' for any operating year shall mean the established investment, less an amount equal to (1) the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge for each preceding operating year, plus (2) the aggregate of the excess earnings, if any, during each preceding operating year applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization in accordance with the provisions of section 705 hereof."

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

SEC. 801. Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$1,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000,000,000."

SEC. 802. Section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(h) The Corporation may subscribe for the nonassessable stock of the Federal National Mortgage Association: *Provided*, That the total face amount of stock so subscribed for and held by the Corporation shall not exceed at any one time $20,000,000."

SEC. 803. The import duties imposed under paragraph 405 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on plywood shall not apply with respect to imports entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with the day following the date of enactment of this act and ending with the close of June 30, 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER (after counting). Obviously, no quorum is 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. 121]

Andrews, N. Y.	Keefe	Robertson
Brown, Ohio	Kerr	Simpson, Pa.
Case, S. Dak.	Lane	Smith, Maine
Celler	Ludlow	Stigler
Clippinger	Macy	Taber
Dawson, Ill.	Morton	Thomas, N. J.
Engel, Mich.	O'Toole	West
Hartley	Peden	Wigglesworth
Havenner	Powell	Wilson, Ind.
Johnson, Ind.	Preston	Wood
Johnson, Okla.	Regan	
Johnson, Tex.	Rivers	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a highly controversial measure. The interesting thing about this particular legislation which is presented to the House, is that the controversy concerning the measure is not what is in the bill but that which is not included in the bill. The bill which is presented to the House today is a housing measure, supported and passed by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, and establishes procedure to alleviate the critical housing shortage which exists in America today.

Those portions of the bill which have been eliminated are the controversial sections of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. So the bill is presented today on the issue whether or not the bill shall be passed by the House, or whether or not it shall be defeated because the so-called controversial issues in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill are not included therein.

In order that we may understand the issue more clearly, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill contained three main segments. The first segment was in general provisions which are in this bill today. Those had to do with the expansion of credit and the establishment of devices to assist the construction of homes for veterans and others in the country who are in need of housing.

The second provision is the slum-clearance provision, which is controversial. But the most highly controversial provision of the legislation, of course, is the public-housing feature.

The issue which has been presented by the proponents of the public housing feature of this bill is this: They say, first, there is a critical housing shortage in the country today, and, secondly, that we need housing for the poor of the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is my point that this bill, so far as the public housing feature is concerned, does neither. It neither takes care of the critical housing feature nor does it house the poor. Of course, as the gentleman from Louisiana said yesterday, the bill does have the support of a great many organizations.

I sat upon the committe day after day and week after week, listening to the testimony of people representing these organizations. They came before our committee and said, "There is a critical housing shortage in America today. There are people living in conditions which are not safe or sanitary. Therefore, we should alleviate that condition."

So what? So we should pass the public housing measure.

I want, in my brief time, to analyze that particular position. The real issue, as I see it, is not whether there are poor people in the country who require housing. The real issue is not whether there are slums in the country which should be cleared and rebuilt. The real issue is the method by which these things may be done. That, Mr. Speaker, is the issue which I challenge the proponents of the public housing bill to talk about today. Not talk about the fact that we have poor people in the country who should be helped; not talk about the critical housing shortage, but talk about the method by which they say we should approach this particular problem.

What is that method? There are a large number of families whose average income is $150 per month. The question is, Shall the Government build homes for a select few of those people, and then pay a portion of their rent? That is the real issue in connection with the public housing feature of this program.

I oppose the public housing program because I believe it is discriminatory. I believe it grants a privilege to a select people in the country.

The program suggested by the public housing proponents provides a discrimination as to areas within the United States. How does it provide for discrimination as to areas? Let us look at the record and see what has happened under the program as it has been conducted in the past. As you know, there are a number of housing programs in existence. Four States, for instance, in the United States, have the most housing units in the country. It is rather interesting to note of two out of the four States one is Texas and the other is Florida.

The State of Missouri, with two great industrial cities, has no housing units. Fifteen States have no public housing units. Miami, the playground of the rich, stands high in the number of housing units in any city. Peoria has almost twice as many as has Chicago.

Thus, we see the helter-skelter discriminatory distribution of public housing. Why is it that the people of St. Louis who are in exactly the same circumstances as the people of Miami, are not treated with the same consideration? It is because of the administration and method of distribution provided for in the public-housing law.

The law permits discrimination between persons. It gives to a select few a privilege not afforded a great number of similarly situated persons. Pete Smith is permitted to live in a nice apartment at low cost, but his neighbors, John

Jones, Joe Doakes, and many others are not afforded this privilege. These other folks have low incomes, but they will pay taxes to contribute to Pete Smith's rent.

Pete Smith has been selected by an administrator, not because he is the poorest, but because he is able to pay the amount of rent required and is just one of the needy among all of the applicants.

The occupants of slums are not, by the public-housing legislation, automatically placed into the new homes. Their dwellings may be demolished and, in many instances, the record shows that they are moved to further and worse slums and other more fortunate people are granted admission to the public-housing units.

Discrimination and privilege, and even political expediency is permitted by the public housing law which our committee considered.

The Government grants assistance to the needy. It aids in education and the building of roads. In all of these programs, however, the money available is distributed to all of the States so that all persons similarly situated may receive at least some benefit. Here, for the first time, it is proposed to ignore the needs of a great majority and grant benefits to a select and privileged few.

The motives of those great organizations and well-meaning people who want to solve the critical housing shortage and who want to provide decent housing for low-income people cannot be questioned. I do, without fear of contradiction, however, state that these people have not carefully analyzed the operation of the public housing law proposed by the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

There are others, however, who have no interest in maintaining private enterprise, initiative, and the American approach to problems such as these. These people would regiment our citizens, control them by a bureaucracy in Washington, all under the guise of humane activity. It is with this latter group that I part company. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am opposing the public-housing feature of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and am supporting the present measure which will provide homes for veterans, homes for the young people of our Nation, and maintain our Republic.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we recently fought a war that cost us not less than $350,000,000,000, and the best blood of the youth of our country. We achieved a victory, but we have not yet achieved the peace we fought for. Probably the greatest domestic issue that now presents itself to the American people is housing, to house the men who fought our battles and who came home and had no place to live. That is a question that deserves the greatest consideration.

In our committee we have always had friendliness, kindliness, and sportsmanship. I have an admiration and affection for our chairman, but this bill seemed to do something to him that I have not seen heretofore. We prepared a bill and voted it out and we went before the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee made a proposition that I have never heard made to a legislative committee in all the long years I have been here. They told us that if there were some members of the committee who would stultify themselves and change their vote we might get a rule. I am glad to say no Democratic Member accepted that invitation and the rule was tabled. Then in the evening we got a notice to appear at 9 o'clock the next morning in the Banking and Currency Committee, and at that meeting the bill which you are now considering was read rapidly. When the reading was completed, although Members were asking for recognition, no one was recognized to offer a substitute, no one was recognized to offer an amendment, no one was recognized to make a point of order that the House was then in session and the bill could not be reported according to the rules of the House; but the bill was arbitrarily reported out. The rules of the House and the democratic processes were thrown out of the window.

You have heard a good deal of talk about socialism in the housing bill. The exercise of arbitrary power anywhere in a republic by the elected officials is more dangerous than socialism; and that is the bill you have here today, all of the provisions in which the people of America had expressed the greatest interest were taken out of the bill: Low rent housing for the veterans, which we greatly need, and many other desirable provisions are out of the bill; and they bring back here a bill that will have no effect, it seems to me, upon the housing problem of the American people except to give special and unconscionable privileges to a favored few.

I have done everything I could to assist in passage of legislation that would result in more housing for our veterans and other citizens, but I am confident this bill will not accomplish that purpose. S. 866, which has been passed by the Senate, is now on the Speaker's table and after the passage of this bill it could be taken from the table, everything stricken out after the enacting clause, and the provisions of the House bill inserted; and the Senate bill as so amended, passed by the House. This bill would immediately go to conference and would expedite the final passage of a bill. As the Chairman says, he will not adopt this procedure I feel confident we will have no housing bill at this Congress that will in the least degree solve the problem that is presented.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL].

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with misgivings and uncertainty that I approach the necessity of making a decision as to how to vote on this housing bill. In my opinion, this bill in its present form is incomplete without the public housing provisions. The very group most in need of assistance in order to obtain adequate and decent housing, namely the lowest income group, will not participate in the benefits of this bill. As the report of the Joint Congressional Committees on Housing has said: "The committee does not see how, as a matter of simple justice, it can recommend a housing program which would aid all groups of our citizenry except the very one which is most in need of aid."

Many of my colleagues have raised the contention that for the Government to undertake to assist in providing public housing for the lowest income group is socialism. It seems that whenever anyone suggests the utilization of Government resources for those most in need, he is branded a Socialist. It certainly is not socialism for the Government to plan a mere 500,000 living units over a period of 10 years when the need is so great and the shortage so acute. When we needed guns, tanks, planes, and ships during the war, the Government provided them and provided them hurriedly. We need decent, habitable living quarters for the lowest income group of our population today, and the Government should assist. Private enterprise is not interested, and venture capital is unwilling to provide houses for those most in need. It therefore seems indispensable for Government to implement and augment the inadequacies and deficiencies of private enterprise. This is not socialism. It is democracy in action—not a static democracy heedless of the less fortunate, but a live democracy that concerns itself with the welfare of its people. Socialism, communism, and delinquency are nourished in poverty and nurtured in squalor. Their seeds do not find root in wholesome, clean, and habitable living conditions.

In what way is it socialism to provide housing assistance to the lowest income group, but not socialism to assist others who are better able financially to provide themselves a home? In what way is it more socialistic to seek to assist those most in need of assistance than it is for the Government to guarantee repayment of loans to those who lend money with real estate as security?

The bill as passed by the Senate with the public housing provisions contained therein has been years in the making. It has been discussed and debated in the Houses of Congress, in the press, in periodicals, on the air, and in public forums. Extensive committee hearings have been held in all sections of the country. I sincerely regret that the Members of this House will not have the opportunity to vote on public housing as embraced in the Senate bill.

Senator TAFT, who perhaps knows as much about this subject as anyone, has said that there are 6,000,000 homes which are slum dwellings, in which children should not be reared. It is abundantly clear, both on the record of performance and from the testimony of witnesses before congressional committees, that private housing for our lowest income group cannot be provided by private industry with building costs, labor costs and material costs as high as they are at the present time, because they cannot earn a reasonable return on their investment and at the same time charge rentals which members of the lowest in-

come group can afford to pay. Why is it proper for the United States Government to guarantee a mortgage loan on a private house, and fail to guarantee a reasonable return on private investment made to build low-cost housing?

In my own city of St. Louis, a recommendation which has the support of representative citizens of all groups and of all parties and of all classes has been made by the antislum commission of the city of St. Louis, that a bond issue be authorized in the amount of $16,000,000 which sum will be used to acquire slum property to raze it, and to turn over the land to private individuals for the construction of low-cost housing. The authorization of this bond issue will appear on the ballot at the next general election. Without congressional authorization for public housing, such projects as this cannot possibly succeed.

The members of the antislum commission of St. Louis in their report stated, with reference to the need for Federal aid:

> It does seem likely that the necessities of the case and the needs of the cities cry aloud for relief.

The individuals who prepared this report are not socialists, but industrialists, businessmen and labor leaders in my community. Their report virtually has the support of all enterprising civic groups in St. Louis. In my sincere belief it is indeed unfortunate that the courageous citizens who have undertaken such a project cannot obtain the support of Congress to overcome what is rapidly becoming our number one national problem—adequate housing for all groups and classes of the American people.

In the area of the city covered by this report of the antislum commission, it was found that 58 percent of the present structures have no baths, 25 percent have outside toilets, and 10 percent are without any running water.

Another gloomy picture appears in the St. Louis Veterans' Service Center. Since January 1, 1946, a total of 14,297 applications for homes for World War II veterans have been received. During that period only 8,847 units have been registered with that office. Typical listings of residential units appeared last month. Of 126 listings received last month, only 35 would accept children. One hundred nineteen of the 126 units were merely furnished rooms. Not a single listing in more than 5 months contained a private bath. The record shows that the housing director of the veterans' service center in St. Louis has been unable to provide one apartment or flat during 1948.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing figures impress me with the dire need of adequate legislation in the housing field. The only complete answer and solution to the problem would be the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as passed by the Senate. Since the Members of the House will not have an opportunity to vote on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, it is with reluctance that I cast my vote in favor of the pending legislation before us. Since there is no alternative, I shall vote for this bill rather than nothing at all.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

HOUSING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill should be defeated for the reason the House has already passed a bill to extend title VI, which is in the Senate now and has been there for months; the House has already passed what is known as the Fanny May bill or the Federal National Mortgage Association. It is in the Senate right now. Any other part of this bill that is desirable could be put on by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has some very undesirable parts in it. Members who understand this bill will not vote for it unless they vote for something that I believe is against their convictions. I refer to the fact that in title IV of this bill the tax incentive for production of additional rental housing accommodations provides a tax bonus—I repeat, a tax bonus—to people to build rental houses, including hotels, penthouses, apartment hotels, any kind of a rental-housing unit. For that they will get a tax bonus. That will cause certain people to have an advantage. They can pay higher prices and get a tax bonus. It will increase the price of building materials. Do you want to increase the price of building materials? It will increase the price of housing in this country.

In addition to this skyrocketing of prices it has another great disadvantage. There is a petition on the Clerk's desk now with 167 names on it to bring out a certain bill—the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Up until a few years ago 145 names were sufficient on the theory that that when one-third of the Members of the House want a bill considered they should be given an opportunity to consider that bill. Notwithstanding that the Rules Committee tabled an application for a rule that was pending before it to consider that bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Congress appropriated $100,000 and set up a joint housing committee of the House and Senate, which committee went all over the country conducting hearings and spending that $100,000, the Committee on Banking and Currency heard testimony on housing since December 5, 1945, and presented a bill to the Rules Committee which it turned down flatly because we would not agree to take out certain things that we want in that bill which the testimony proved to us conclusively should be in the bill.

Now, we are asked to consider a bill here under a gag rule. It is not brought up in a way that you can get legislation. A few minutes ago we had the Commodity Credit Corporation Act up for consideration and the chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, moved to take up the Senate bill, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House Commodity Credit Corporation bill, all because he wanted action, he wanted to expedite it. Why does he not do that now? Why does he not take up the Senate bill S. 866, strike out all after the enacting clause and send this bill to conference where it can be ironed out? The absence of any action in that direction and the failure to do that is an indication to me that an effort is not being made to expedite this legislation. So, if you pass it like it is it will be an excuse as to why housing legislation cannot pass. So, the thing to do, Members of the House, is to kill this bill. It is not needed; it is objectionable. It is a millionaire's bonus bill, that is what it is. I repeat, it is a millionaire's bonus bill. It is a tax bonus to the rich to skyrocket prices. I hope you will vote against this bill.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as a proponent of the T-E-W bill, I would like to serve notice that we will continue unremittingly in our efforts to enact into law the so-called hotly disputed issues which, nevertheless, found favor with the majority of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. These are the titles on governmentally aided housing research, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment, federally assisted low-rent housing, and rural housing.

Veterans and other citizens regard the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill passed by the Senate, S. 866, as the key to whether or not Congress will authorize a comprehensive attack on the drastic housing shortage. The country will take our action on the bill before us now as being a refusal to make such a comprehensive attack. This may be unjustified, but it is the fact. The confidence of the people concerned with the need for housing would have been immediately established by passage of S. 866 in the House. This confidence would itself have done much to stimulate the broadest housing program for all classes of the population. The real difficulty is one of costs. Although there are likely to be over 900,000 home units built this year, both for rental and for sale, they are generally way out of reach in price of the veteran of modest income and of the ordinary citizen whom the housing shortage hurts the most. In fact, the gravest danger of this construction is that it will flood the market with high-priced housing and bring on a housing-market debacle interfering with all construction. The passage of S. 866 would have given us a balanced housing program and preserved an active and prosperous housing market for years, as indeed the economic conditions require that it should be preserved. There is little question that the House will pass the bill before us, but to those who have worked so long and so hard for the T-E-W bill I say that they are right, and the work must continue, as before long the whole Congress will see that what it has done is not enough and that a general housing program by the enactment of the omitted titles of the T-E-W bill is essential if we are to lick the housing shortage.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote "present" on this bill because I cannot and will not abandon the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the final section of this bill. It would remove the present tariff on plywood for a period of 1 year. This section suddenly appeared on this housing legislation without notice or warning, without hearings, and from a committee which has no right to submit legislation on the subject of tariffs. Before any such legislation is reported to the House or enacted, the American plywood industry should have the right to state its case. It should have the right to show, as it easily can, that our plywood production increased 25 percent in 1948 and that 65 percent increase in production above the 1947 figure is anticipated in the year 1949; that there are 41 plywood plants in Oregon, Washington, and northern California, which number will be increased to 50 by the end of this year and will total 60 by the end of 1949. There will be ample American-produced plywood for American building needs. It would be a crime against a great American industry which employs thousands upon thousands of people, to break its financial back in this way without allowing fair and ordinary consideration of the facts involved. If this section is enacted into law such action in the haste of the closing hours of this session will be in direct violation of the fundamental principles of our legislative system.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Oregon who preceded me, I am opposed to the concluding section of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this housing bill (H. R. 6955) contains in its last provision—section 803—a proposal for the removal of all tariffs on plywood for 1 year.

The present tariff on fir plywood is 40 percent ad valorem. Section 803 of this bill proposes to remove this tariff entirely for the next year.

Not a minute of hearing has been given to the plywood industry upon how this proposal would affect this industry or its tens of thousands of employees.

To rush this tariff-removal proposal through without an opportunity for any member of a great industry to be heard is not right, not just, and not fair.

What will the effect of this removal of the tariff on Canadian and Mexican plywood be? Some of the makers of plywood in my district tell me the result well may be that they will have to close their plants. They cannot compete, without a tariff, against the cheaper wages and cheaper costs of Canadian and Mexican plywood manufacturers.

In Canada the average wage in the plywood industry is 92½ cents an hour. In our plywood mills of Oregon and Washington the average wage is $1.62 an hour, or 65 percent higher than in Canada.

The cost of logs in Canada also is about 65 percent cheaper than in the United States.

How can an American manufacturer of plywood paying a 65-percent higher wage than a Canadian manufacturer compete with him unless a tariff compensates for the differences of wages in this country and abroad? He cannot.

The American plywood manufacturer has been doing a good job in increasing production to meet increased building needs. No industry has done a better one.

In 1947 the weekly production of plywood in the two States of Oregon and Washington was 29,000,000 square feet a week.

At the present time the weekly production is averaging 36,000,000 square feet weekly or an increase of almost 25 percent above last year.

It is now estimated that by the end of this year the output will be 40,000,000 square feet weekly and by 1949 will be 44,000,000 square feet weekly.

At the present time nine new plywood plants are under construction in the two States of Oregon and Washington. Five of them are expected to be finished and in operation by the end of this year and the four others are scheduled to go into operation next year.

If we remove this plywood tariff will the men who are pouring new capital into building new plants go ahead with these new projects? I doubt it. If we enact here a law that says to American plywood manufacturers that the Congress is going to compel Americans who pay wages of $1.62 an hour, wages to compete with Canadian producers where the wages are only 92½ cents an hour, and with Mexican producers where wages are much less than in Canada, we are going to put a brake on the risk capital going into plywood factories. In the long run that will do more harm to housing than it will do good.

Section 803 of this bill proposes to open our doors to the free import of Canadian plywood. But Canada at the same time has an embargo on logs. Our plywood manufacturers cannot get a single log out of Canada, even if they want to. They cannot ship those logs out of Canada even if they own timber in Canada. Canada will not permit them to ship these logs over the border into the United States. If Americans who own timber in Canada want to cut that timber into plywood, they have to go up to Canada and build their plywood mills in Canada.

The great unfairness in this whole proposal is that the plywood industry, which would be disastrously affected by this free-trade policy, has not been given a single minute of time before any committee of Congress to tell its side of the story. We are denying this industry its traditional right to its day in court.

Sometime ago, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] introduced a bill into Congress proposing to do just what section 803 of this housing bill proposes to do. It was very properly referred to the Ways and Means Committee, which handles tariff-making matters. I talked to five or six members of the Ways and Means Committee. They all assured me that before any action was taken on the Grant bill that the plywood industry would be given an opportunity for a hearing.

That was fair.

But, now a new committee, a committee which never heretofore has handled tariff matters, the Banking and Currency Committee, steps into the picture. This committee, without giving Members of Congress or members of the affected industry a chance to be heard or to tell its side of the story, presents this section 803 which may wreak great damage to an industry that employs tens of thousands of workers. That is not fair to this industry. It is not in keeping with the American tradition of fair play.

Before any great and far-reaching reform to our tariff system is made, the industry or industries affected ought to have a chance to be heard. They ought to get their day in court.

Furthermore, if Canadian plywood is to be admitted duty free into the United States we at least ought to insist that Canada remove the embargo against Canadian logs being permitted to cross the border into the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD].

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I am likewise opposed to this provision of the bill which would remove all import restrictions on plywood. There is no person in this House more anxious than I am to see the housing situation alleviated but certainly by taking the restrictions off of only one of the hundreds of items which go into building a house, we are not going to accomplish that purpose. If this House were considering removal of restrictions on all building materials in short supply, that would be, indeed, a totally different story, but here we are acting on only one small segment of the building material industry. As such it is objectionable to me. I realize that under the status of this bill that it cannot be here amended but I earnestly request the conferees to consider these objections during the conference meetings and to there remove this particular clause.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill as it is the only vehicle which we have to do anything about housing in this Congress I am one of those that had hoped we would have had a chance to consider some of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill that provide for slum clearance, subsidized housing, and so forth. I do not know whether these provisions are sound or not, as I have not had the opportunity to study them. But I would have welcomed the opportunity of listening to a debate on these provisions by the members of the committee who listened to the evidence.

However, this bill and others do provide some very substantial benefits that will aid veterans and will, I believe, stimulate the building of houses. It is very significant that in 1946 when the Government was building houses we only had 437,800 houses built. But in 1947 when private enterprise got into full swing we completed 835,100 houses and the trend for the first 5 months of 1948 indicates that we will exceed that total.

Of course, the most sound system is one where each person needing a house is able to buy it and not rely on the

Government to furnish him a house. Those of us who have gotten our homes in that way realize the satisfaction of buying and owning our own home, no matter how small it may be. We are hoping that especially those who served us during the war and who made us secure through their sacrifices may be able to get help from the provisions of this act and obtain a start on a home of their own.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to protest the high-handed action of the leadership of this House in bringing about the defeat of the comprehensive Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

The sell-out to the real-estate and building lobbies that have swarmed over this Hill for the past 2 years, is complete—public housing for the benefit of veterans and civilians in the low-income groups is gone—slum clearance to rid this country of the slums that are a stench in the nostrils of every American, has been put aside.

I am voting against this so-called housing bill as a protest against the betrayal of the veterans of this country who have waited in vain for 3 years for Congress to act on housing. They will have to go on waiting due to the action of the House this day.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who favored the T-E-W bill, I shall vote for the passage of the Wolcott bill with the hope that it may go to the Senate and that through that method it may reach a conference committee. There are numerous features in the bill which do not meet with my approval, but unless it is passed by the House there will be no opportunity for action at this session.

THE SUPPORT FOR THE BILL

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the House had reason to believe that it would have an opportunity to vote on the comprehensive Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Instead we are confronted by the Republican leadership with a bill which makes a mockery of our efforts to enact a housing program.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has behind it the united support of hundreds of national and local public interest groups, veterans' organizations, and labor unions whose combined memberships total tens of millions of American citizens. Let us start with the veterans of World War II, who perhaps more than any other segment of our population have felt the pinch of insufficient housing. We in Congress have made all sorts of extravagant promises to these veterans. But have we enacted any legislation to aid the veteran who does not earn enough to buy the $12,000 and $13,000 houses that private enterprise is building today, or the veteran whose income is too small for the pitifully small amount of rental housing on today's market?

Every major veterans' organization in the country sees in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill the promise of decent homes. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, American Veterans of World War II, Catholic War Veterans, and Disabled American Veterans endorse and vigorously support this measure. The American Legion approves the public housing provisions of the bill. Just last March more than 1,300 delegates representing these and several other national organizations met in this city. Many of you were visited by veteran delegates whose only objective was to secure passage of the bill that would mean decent homes at prices they could afford. This is surely an objective no Member of Congress can afford to ignore.

The National Conference of Catholic Charities has been in the vanguard of the fight for better housing. The Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary of the conference, has consistently taken issue with those who brand all advocates of public housing as Communists or Socialists. He points out that—

> Those of us who are committed to private enterprise would like to see private capital provide housing for all the people, but so far as I am aware, private capital has never presented a feasible plan for reaching this objective.

People from all over the country have gone on record in support of public housing. Leading professional and occupational organizations have taken a positive stand in favor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Among these are the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Institute of Law Officers, the American Institute of Architects, and the American Municipal Association. Mayor George W. Welsh, Grand Rapids, Mich., president of the Conference of Mayors, made this splendid endorsement of the federally aided public-housing program:

> The improvement in health, happiness, and good citizenship of the families rehoused has been dramatic. Public housing has served families of low income and has not competed with private homebuilding. But much remains to be done and all of us must dedicate ourselves to the task of seeing to it that this great program is continued.

Time will not permit me to list the hundreds of organizations which have gone on record in favor of public housing. However, you all recognize these groups: The National League of Women Voters, the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Jewish Women, and the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Such organizations as the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Federation of Postal Clerks, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, the American Association of Social Workers, the American Public Health Association, and the Family Service Association of America, all support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

What other segments of America endorse the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill? Last month the National Conference of Family Life met here in Washington. Nine hundred delegates from 125 national organizations, whose membership totals more than 40,000,000 people, heard President Truman say that the housing shortage is the most pressing problem for American families. Calling for passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, the President said that the problem was a vital one that prevented millions of veterans from finding homes for themselves, their wives, and children.

At this same conference, Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, said:

> In my opinion one of the great disruptive factors in American family life is our lack of decent housing. Slums are the curse of our society. No one of our big cities is without them, but they are not confined to metropolitan areas. * * * They are the national disgrace of the most gifted, richest, and most powerful nation on earth. They are festering sores in our social structure.

Certainly none of us can deny that Eric Johnston is representative of private enterprise. However, he recognizes that on the issue of decent homes, private and public enterprise must join forces. He advocated a course of action that is implemented by the T-E-W bill, when he further said:

> I would like to see industry move in on the housing front in a forceful, determined way. There is no doubt in my mind that if the industrial leaders of this country wished to do so they could bring about, in cooperation with the widely used organizing power of the state, a housing program which would meet our needs and stimulate private construction at one and the same time.

The housing committee of the National Conference on Family Life concluded its sessions with a ringing endorsement of the T-E-W bill.

Less than a month later, in a letter to my distinguished colleague from New York, Representative JACOB JAVITS, Mr. Eric Johnston again took the occasion to urge passage of the T-E-W bill which has been called socialistic and the forerunner of communism by these myopic leaders of the opposition forces. Mr. Johnston said:

> If there ever was a "must" bill, this is it. It has been a "must" bill for a long time. It is a "must" bill today. It should be taken up and passed by the House with all possible expedition. It would be a tragedy, in my judgment, if this bill were to be sidetracked or defeated at this session. This bill fills a need which must be met in the interest of all the people of America.

There are other open-minded supporters of a free-enterprise system who stoutly defend federally aided public housing.

Last year, Jerome M. Ney, chairman of the board of the American Retail Federation, testified before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I have the honor of membership on this important committee. Mr. Ney himself operates several retail stores, the principal one being the Boston Store Dry Goods Co., of Fort Smith, Ark. No one could be more typical of private enterprise than this merchant. This is what Mr. Ney said about the T-E-W bill:

> Let's put good sense ahead of emotion. A substantial portion of the Nation's families at the bottom of the income pyramid simply cannot afford adequate housing. We agree with Senator TAFT that subsidized public housing, at least for a time, is the only sensible answer to this problem.

Mr. Ney is another one of those enlightened American businessmen who scoff at the socialism label tied to public housing by those who rant the loudest and say the least. He declared that:

> We cannot agree that this type of public housing contains the threat of socialism in the housing industry. On the contrary, we believe that the greatest threat to private enterprise in housing is the failure to meet the housing problem head-on.

This intelligent American went on to say:

> I can think of no other sphere in which there is a greater need for the advocates of private enterprise to display enlightened self-interest and the qualities of initiative, imagination, daring, and energy which have made our Nation great. I can think of no other area where blind emotion and unenlightened selfishness can cause private enterprise to fail more miserably and more quickly than in housing.

Permit me to pursue this vein a bit further. I am proud that among the realtors of America there are some wise men who regard the T-E-W bill as the answer to the Nation's housing shortage. Mr. William Reinhart, of Philadelphia, berates the lobbyists who would condemn our low-income citizens to shack homes. Mr. Reinhart boasts of the fact that he has been a Philadelphia realtor for more than 40 years. He has been a director of one of the largest Federal savings and loan associations in Philadelphia and is chairman of that city's housing authority.

Perhaps there are some fellow realtors who regard Mr. Reinhart as a traitor to their business. What does Mr. Reinhart think of the T-E-W bill? In writing to Members of Congress last week, he said:

> I wish to say to you that I believe that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill provides the best method of meeting our present housing shortage.

To illustrate just how absurd are the lobby's charges that public housing lacks the support of private enterprise, let me tell you what an executive of one of the Nation's largest insurance companies said last year. George S. Van Schaik, executive vice president and head of the mortgage loan department, New York Life Insurance Co., declared:

> If and when certain segments of the population are in an income group where they cannot pay an economic rent for safe and decent shelter, then there should be provided adequate standard housing so subsidized as to bring it within the grasp of those who qualify for it.

Substantial public support for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill comes from community leaders throughout the country. These are the people who have an intimate knowledge of and a sympathetic understanding of the human problems caused by poor housing. These are the priests, the pastors, the rabbis, the social workers, the doctors, the lawyers, and other local and national figures who have waged an unceasing fight for better housing.

Last year more than 100 New York organizations joined forces in behalf of the T-E-W bill. For these people, decent housing for low-income families is not socialism or communism or an infringement of the rights of private enterprise. Three vice presidents of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Committee of New York were Rt. Rev. Charles E. Gilbert, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York; the Very Reverend Msgr. E. Roberts Moore, archdiocesan representative of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York, and the Reverend Dr. David De Sola Pool, representative of the Synagogue Council and the New York Board of Rabbis.

It seems obvious to me that even the most obstinate of my colleagues must realize by now that support for public housing comes from so large a segment of our population that we can no longer afford to ignore its opinions.

In contrast to this overwhelming support, the opposition to public housing comes principally from four or five national organizations representing the real-estate interests, the property owners, the home and apartment house builders, and their various affiliates throughout the country. These are the people who say to the Government, "Leave us alone, and we'll build all the houses the country needs." But, alas, they cannot build for the great mass of veterans, or for the store clerk or the factory worker and still show a profit. The so-called spokesmen for the opposition maintain that they have the best interests of the Nation at heart. Yet one well known lobbyist for the real-estate interests, Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, had the brazen effrontery to write the following in his official journal, Headlines, for June 9, 1947:

> Today the great threat to democratic institutions, to the republican form of government, and ultimately to freedom itself lies in our big cities. They are populated for the most part with the mass-man, devoid of intelligence, devoid of civic responsibility.

Does Mr. Nelson believe that those Members of Congress who conscientiously represent millions of Americans in urban areas will applaud the following conclusion:

> Our one hope of survival as a free country is that rural and semirural areas still dominate most of the State legislatures through their representatives and still dominate the House of Representatives in Washington. Our best hope for the future is to keep it that way.

As a corollary to these devious arguments, these opponents of public housing have seized upon a convenient shibboleth. Anybody who believes that the Federal Government should be concerned with decent housing for low-income families is immediately labeled a Communist and/or a Socialist. Mr. Nelson himself last year tagged Senator ROBERT TAFT, one of the bill's three sponsors, as a follower of the Communist Party line. He later apologized publicly to the Senator, but still continued to smear other supporters of decent housing who openly fight for their beliefs.

Public housing has recently been labeled, "The key to socialism." But public housing is not the key to socialism or communism or any other alien ism. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, with its various aids to private enterprise, will open the door to a new and better life for the thousands of our fellow citizens now living in slums and broken-down tenements. The T-E-W bill means decent homes for our veterans who are getting tired of empty promises and who find little comfort in the advertisements featuring twelve- and thirteen-thousand-dollar homes for "GI's only." We cannot continue to shut our ears to the pleas for decent homes for America's low-income families. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is the answer to these pleas. After all, do we represent only the real-estate interests, the property owners, the home and apartment builders, or do we represent all of America, including the ill-housed?

THE REPUBLICANS HAVE FAILED TO SOLVE THE HOUSING PROBLEM

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress has failed to solve the Nation's No. 1 social problem—the need of 15,000,000 families for 15,000,000 houses in which to live. Among these 15,000,000 families are many veterans who fought to preserve our Nation in World War II. During the war, we promised them a new and shining world, awaiting their return. We promised them jobs, cars, homes, furnishings, and all the comforts of a high standard of living.

That was when Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini threatened the national life of our Democracy. The veterans did the job we asked them to do. They defeated the dictators. Our American way of life was saved. The veterans sacrificed years of their lives, suffered a million casualties and over 300,000 lost their lives.

They have been home 3 years. What have we done to make good on our promises? The record is shameful. We have welched on our promises. We as a Nation have lied to them and let them down. Congress protected the people from inflation during the war by price control and rationing. It was not pleasant, but it was fairly successful. Its success can be measured now, by the inflation disaster which has occurred since OPA was killed.

Since June 1946, the last month of OPA, the cost of food has increased 42.8 percent. The over-all cost of living has increased more than 27 percent.

The cost of building supplies has skyrocketed and the new homes we promised the veterans have become so expensive they cannot buy them. A six-room house that sold in 1940 for five or six thousand dollars is now priced at twelve to fourteen thousand dollars. The ordinary wage-earning veteran cannot buy and pay for a home on today's inflated price level.

Why has this situation developed?

First, because Congress killed price control in June 1946 and took the brakes off of inflation. Congress listened to the propaganda of the profit hogs, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the real-estate lobby.

Second, Congress has consistently failed to pass housing legislation to solve the housing problem. While Congress has placed the credit of the Government behind the real-estate and builders' lobby

to build high-priced homes, they have failed to encourage slum clearance, public housing for the lowest income group, and the building of medium-priced homes on a basis which the average wage earner could buy and pay for. This great class of veterans and nonveterans are completely priced out of the market.

It is common knowledge that over 40,000,000 taxpayers earn less than $3,000 per year. I submit to you a fact which is acknowledged by any intelligent person, these people cannot buy and pay for $12,000 to $15,000 homes out of this modest yearly wage. After income-tax deductions and the expense of today's inflated food, clothing and other commodity prices, people in the $3,000 per year or less income bracket cannot make the large monthly payments necessary to carry such a debt burden.

We are faced then with a situation which forces millions of fine American citizens to "double up" in crowded, substandard dwellings. The social impact of this housing deficiency contributes to divorce, sickness, crime, and juvenile delinquency.

Society has to pay the cost either way. Why not then try the preventative way?

Federal assistance in slum clearance, and low-income bracket rentals of decent modern homes in clean and healthy surroundings, will in my opinion, pay for itself in the reduction of our present crime and charity costs. Although the cry of "socialism" has been raised by the real-estate and builders' lobby, whose only thought is the perpetuation of their present guaranteed profit set-up under title 6 of the FHA, we are not deceived by this ancient "red herring."

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, against which they protest so loudly and bitterly, a bill which calls for slum clearance and Federal aid in low-income rental construction, is no more socialistic than title VI. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has been endorsed by the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, the Catholic and Protestant church groups, and all the great American labor unions. It bears the name of the most conservative Republican candidate for the Presidency, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT.

The real-estate and builders' lobby are strong for a $2,000,000,000 guaranty of mortgages under title VI, FHA. Let us analyze this extension of Federal credit for the benefit of a private business group. What does it do?

First, the Government guarantees the builder 90 percent insurance on his mortgages. In other words, the builder is guaranteed that he will receive 90 percent of his capital back from any house he builds. It removes the risk from his business by protecting his capital investment, with taxpayers' funds. It also guarantees him a profit and interest on his profit equity, by protecting the banks in the discount of mortgage paper.

And yet, there are the people—the real-estate and builders' groups—who yell "socialism" when the Government proposes aid for the low-income people.

They are perfectly willing for the Government to use tax funds to fill their pockets with inflated building profits, but they scream "socialism" when people who cannot afford their high-priced houses have an opportunity for release from the shacks and tenement slums.

As far as I am concerned, my position is clear. I intend to do all in my power to provide decent homes for the people of my district and the Nation. Charity begins at home, and the need of an American family for a decent home in which to rear their family transcends the selfish desires of hypocrites who benefit by Federal mortgage guaranties in their private business. These people remind me of the dog in the manger—while they are enjoying the profits guaranteed by Federal credit, they wish to deny the unfortunate people who cannot afford to pay their inflated profit prices the right to live in decent homes erected by the Federal credit aid.

I shall support the efforts of free enterprise to fill the need for additional houses, but when free enterprise refuses or cannot profitably meet society's need, then and then only, I shall discharge what I conceive to be Federal responsibility for the welfare of the common people, who do the work and fight the wars of our Nation.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am disgusted with the action of this Congress on many things, but I am particularly disgusted with the manner in which it is proceeding to consider the housing bill. The tactics leading up to the consideration of the bill before us are not the tactics of a representative form of government. They are the tactics of special privilege. They are clearly the tactics of the real-estate lobby.

During the final days of the first session of the Eightieth Congress an appropriation of $100,000 was made for the Joint Housing Committee to study the problem of housing. This committee toured the country from one end to the other and submitted a report recommending legislation to meet this critical problem. The other body a few weeks ago passed legislation known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, which embodied most of the recommendations of the committee that investigated housing. The measure then went to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. Extensive hearings were held, but no new testimony was developed. Finally the committee was forced to report a bill to the House similar to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and many of us hoped we would see the enactment of a comprehensive housing program. Our hopes were short-lived, because the Committee on Rules declined to permit the matter to come before the House. Instead of a comprehensive program of housing, we are today offered a weak substitute—something the real-estate lobby will permit the House to consider. Housing legislation in this Congress must first be cleared through the real-estate lobby before the elected representatives of the people have a chance to vote on it. This bill has the approval of the real-estate lobby. That is the only reason it was permitted to come before the House. It is good for the lobby. It will make the lobby stronger. It will make the lobby richer, but it is not going to provide the thousands of homes and rental units we need so badly at prices people can afford to pay. It is not going to help metropolitan centers like St. Louis wrestling with the problem of slums. The cities of America are eager and willing to assume their share of the obligation in clearing blighted areas, but they cannot do it alone. In my own city a large bond issue has recently been suggested as a means for eliminating some of the blighted areas. This will give St. Louis an excellent start, but still desperately needed is a program of low-cost public housing to provide houses for those whose homes in the present tenements will give way for this new development. Private industry can and perhaps will meet the bulk of our housing needs, but it is not interested in trying to help the millions whose incomes are so low they are unable to afford standard new housing or standard rental units.

Also desperately needed is a program of housing that will provide for the thousands of veterans and others with homes and rental units at prices they can afford to pay. Practically every house of rental units being built today is in the high-price brackets. We need low-cost housing—and when I say "low cost" I mean just that—not 10- and 15-thousand-dollar homes.

The Republican housing bill before us is going to be just about as effective in solving our housing problems as the Republican anti-inflation bill was in solving the problem of inflation. As many of you will remember, 6 months ago we passed a law against inflation. It is Public Law 395, which many call the "HTGB" law. That stands for "hope things get better." We have all been hoping very vigorously for the past 6 months, but we have not been able to hope down the cost of living one cent. Instead of improving, inflation is worse and prices are higher.

The housing bill before us today is in theory similar to the anti-inflation law. It is little more than a hope that the housing problem will be solved. We are going to "hope up" houses and "hope down" the cost of living. It is important that we hope the right way on the right thing and do not become confused. It would be a sorry day if we should start to "hope down" houses and "hope up" prices. The anti-inflation law and the housing bill we are considering today are the tweedledum and tweedledee of the Eightieth Congress. They are both fakes.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I shall support H. R. 6959, a bill to amend the National Housing Act, because I sincerely believe some housing legislation is better than none at all.

Although H. R. 6959 does not include the public housing provisions which I favor at this time, it does possess many meritorious features for the veterans, who are in need of rental housing.

I shall, of course, continue to favor and press for the enactment of the public-housing section embodied in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The public-housing section of the T-E-W which has been urged by Pennsylvania's able Governor James Duff, the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, Bernard Samuels, and

practically every veteran and civic organization in the country. Again, Mr. Speaker, I will support this legislation and hope that we may be able to take positive action toward the T-E-W before this Congress adjourns.

NEED FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the democratic free enterprise system is the greatest political and economic institution ever devised by man. It has given us under justice the highest standard of living in the world. Through an unparalleled productive process the cost of goods has been brought within the means of an ever greater number of people. No one would contend, however, that ours is a perfect economy. Housing is one part in which there has been a conspicuous lack of success. Instead of bringing good housing to a greater number of families we find today that the gap between the cost of decent housing and the ability of families to pay is greater than ever. Senator FLANDERS of Vermont in his report for the Joint Committee on Housing said:

We, the American people, have long been unable to supply our own housing needs. For half a century the housing industry has barely provided enough new homes to accommodate our population increase. It has failed to replace depreciation and protect our capital investment in housing.

Today, our economy is operating at a high level. Admittedly, as a Nation we are in prosperous times, despite the fact that much of the gain has been wiped out by sharp price increases. The average family income in urban places is in excess of $3,000—and yet, according to the Census Bureau, there are more than 5,000,000 urban families with incomes below $2,000 and 3,000,000 with incomes less than $1,500.

What does an income of $1,500 or even $2,000 mean today? In a study by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, it was shown that in June 1947 it took an average 4-person urban family $3,240 per year to maintain itself at a minimum adequate standard of living. This ranged from a high of $3,458 in Washington, D. C., to a low of $3,000 in New Orleans. These figures will be even higher in view of the price increases which have occurred since last June.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of what appears to be plenty, we have millions of people—including many, many veterans who fought for better—living in shacks and slums which are a disgrace to the American way of life. These human beings, Mr. Speaker, are living in places—no one could call them houses or homes—in which it would be unlawful in most States to keep farm animals. Of course, the reason for the enactment of State laws for the protection of farm animals is clear. Kept in filthy surroundings, the animals which give us meat and milk would contaminate and destroy us.

But what about human beings? Are we as much concerned about the way the slums contaminate our cities? I say to you—if we do not destroy our slums, they will destroy us. Oh, I know some of you are thinking that if we would only pass sanitary housing laws in our States and cities similar to those we have for animals, that the problem would be met. There is a very important difference, however. Every bottle of milk, every pound of meat we buy, has included in the price an amount sufficient to keep the animals under sanitary conditions. The cost of cleanliness for farm animals is borne by all the people.

We do now, in many cities, have laws to protect housing. There is only one trouble. They cannot be enforced to any great extent. If they were, the cost of housing to the people who live in the slums would be so great that it would rob them of necessary food, clothing, and medical care. I know that some of you are probably thinking of the much publicized Baltimore plan—a plan which has been misrepresented by the real-estate lobby as being the solution to the slum problem. Listen to this editorial from the Baltimore Sun:

Baltimore's housing-law-enforcement drive is an excellent one and deserves wide recognition. The city can blush with fitting pride at the publicity given its efforts by the home builders. But no one should assume that Baltimore is doing anything more than making a few dilapidated buildings a little more inhabitable. Housing-law enforcement is not slum clearance, and nothing will make it so.

The solicitor of the city of Pittsburgh testified before the Joint Senate-House Committee on Housing:

In the city of Pittsburgh during the last couple of years we had committee upon committee from the hill district come to us and say health conditions were so intolerable—the plumbing, the ordinary, decent facilities were such it was unsafe to live there. They have asked the city to force the landlords to keep these properties in condition so they can live there. The result of a 2-year effort in that direction—and I think it bears on the basic problem you are considering—all the landlords who have property in the slum area are just milking those properties of all they can get and are not putting any money into repairs. These properties are so old that rehabilitation is impossible, and none of these private industries, who have milked the property and put nothing back in it, have made any effort to solve the problem.

We have a problem of human beings who have nowhere to sleep. When a building gets into such condition that there is fear of killing the people in the building and killing the passersby in the street, we condemn the building and tear it down, but in any way where our inspectors find they can still stay another month, another 2 months, we cannot be so soulless as to forget the needs of our people and put them out on the street, just to penalize the landlord. We would be glad to padlock the houses and penalize the landlord, but we cannot penalize our citizens.

We can enforce our sanitary laws for farm animals, because we, all the people—not the animals—pay for their decent surroundings. As I have already pointed out, the people living in the slums cannot afford to keep themselves in absolute minimum food, clothing, and medical care—let alone pay any more for housing.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, as proven to us over and over again by city officials, health and law enforcement officers, judges, welfare workers, and the clergy, the danger to our society of contamination from the slums is even greater than that from tubercular cattle.

The slum is the breeding place of physical and social disaster. How can children be brought up in the slums to their full potentialities as American citizens?

The children first encounter the cops when they are playing in the streets and get chased, or when they are having a ball game in a narrow alley and a home run crashes through a window. To them, the law means torment and oppression—not justice and protection.

The children never have a chance of growing up in their homes. Their lives are ones of constant escape from the mean surroundings. Where do they turn? The dreary beer joints, the dingy poolrooms and dance halls. Yes; and the houses of prostitution. These are their places of escape.

I could go on and on, with volumes of unquestioned testimony, as to the direct relationship of the slums to health, to juvenile delinquency, to infant mortality, to crime, to mental disorders—testimony given in city after city and by county officers in rural areas. But why must I do this? There cannot be a single Member of this body who does not know these plain facts. The only question, as I see it, is whether we will do something—or nothing.

What we must do is clear. We must rid the Nation of its slums and see that ultimately every American family lives in a dwelling which he can, in decency and dignity, call a home. I freely admit that we cannot do this all at once. It will take years to accomplish. The 500,000 public-housing units provided in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill together with what we have already accomplished, is a good start.

I do not see how in common decency and humanity we can pass any bill without the slum-clearance and public-housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Seven congressional committees over the Seventy-eighth, the Seventy-ninth, and Eightieth Congresses have come to the same conclusion. Twice the Senate has enacted slum-clearance and public-housing legislation. Mr. Speaker, we are a Congress dedicated to the welfare of all the people—and we must act in the interest of all the people. With all the earnestness I have, from the bottom of my heart I ask this body to set us on the road toward a good America—an America with homes fit for Americans.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the housing situation is one of our most vexing problems, I regret that the housing legislation we are now considering is woefully inadequate as a means in remedying present conditions.

For the past several years, family life in America has been shadowed by the lack of suitable living quarters for millions of our citizens. This fact has been continually called to our attention by the newspapers of the Nation, even though it has been common knowledge to all of us.

I have made frequent inquiries during the Eightieth Congress in an effort to

obtain information as to when we would have the opportunity to consider housing legislation. Each time I made such an inquiry I was assured we would get a housing bill that would satisfy the needs of the American people.

The Senate considered and passed its version of housing legislation. Yet, the dying days of the Eightieth Congress were upon us and still the House had no opportunity to consider this pressing problem of the shortage of housing facilities.

These delaying tactics, although they may have been sincere, aroused many of us to the realization that delay meant disaster; and to avoid the spectacle of the Eightieth Congress failing to present a solution to the housing problem, I joined many other Members of the House in signing the discharge petition placed in circulation for the purpose of making certain that we would take action on the Nation's housing problem before adjournment.

Today we are being asked to consider a housing bill, which, while it contains some necessary provisions, is far from satisfactory. This bill does not go far enough in seeking a solution to the housing problem.

I am sure there are many of you who are as disappointed as I am in being denied the opportunity to discuss and amend the present bill. Instead of liberalizing its provisions, we have been given but one choice—either to vote for or against the bill. We have no other alternative, despite the fact that we know deep in our hearts that this bill will not accomplish the objectives of a real housing bill. It is simply a question of casting a negative vote and be accused of being against some of the necessary and desirable features in the bill, or voting for the bill and realizing that we are calling a job finished that is only half done.

Under the circumstances, like many of you, I have no choice but to vote for this bill; but in so doing, I assure you it is a vote cast with great reluctance. It was my fervent hope the past several months that we could perfect a real housing bill that would convey to the average American citizen that we meant business in our efforts to cope with the housing situation.

While we try to point with pride to the activity in the building industry and quote figures on the number of housing units being made ready for occupancy, families continue to live doubled up simply because the average citizen cannot afford to pay housing prices, since they are far beyond his means.

Thousands of veterans are camping out or living in trailers because they have not the income to permit them to raise their families in a typical American frame house.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat my assertion that I am voting for this bill with marked reluctance. It is said "a half loaf is better than none," but this is not true with respect to providing a solution to America's most critical problem—the housing situation.

It is too great a problem to attack with halfway measures, and I regret that we can be charged with short-sightedness in trying to solve the housing shortage in a half-hearted manner.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I regret that under suspensions of the rules Members of the House are precluded from offering amendments to this phony housing bill. If we were operating in a democratic manner this afternoon I would offer an amendment to change the title of this monstrosity to read "The Pent Housing Act of 1948."

We have before us today a choice between two housing bills—H. R. 6959, and S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Normally, of course, we would have expected a Senate-passed bill to be reported out with such amendments as the committee felt desirable. However, on an analysis of the provisions of H. R. 6959 I can well understand why it was not deemed appropriate to report these provisions out as an amendment to S. 866. For it certainly would be a travesty to consider the provisions of H. R. 6959 as an amendment of the provisions of S. 866. In fact, it would be a travesty to consider it as a housing bill at all.

In analyzing the provisions of H. R. 6959, I think that the approach that would be most helpful and significant would be from the point of view of who would be helped by it. Or to put it more succinctly—who counts under its provisions.

Obviously, under H. R. 6959, it is not the farmer who counts. For the bill provides absolutely no aids whatsoever to meet the farm housing needs of our rural population. Not only are the modest provisions in S. 866 completely omitted but there is no attempt whatsoever to provide even the semblance of an alternative program.

Obviously, also, our low-income families do not count. As in the case of the farmer, H. R. 6959 makes this crystal clear not so much by the fact that the S. 866 provisions were omitted as by the fact that H. R. 6959 does not bother to include provisions of any nature whatsoever for the relief of our families and their children who through no fault of their own are now consigned to living in slums.

Obviously, also, under H. R. 6959 our moderate-income families do not count either. While the bill does condescend to include the yield insurance program, it does not contain, except in a drastically modified and aborted form—and even then only on a 9-month basis—the necessary programs to extend FHA mortgage insurance to meet the needs of families of moderate income—and this is true both in connection with home ownership and rental housing. Likewise, H. R. 6959 completely and cavalierly ignores the necessary long-range research programs contained in S. 866 which are effectively designed to help reduce construction costs and so help bring home ownership and rental housing costs within the reach of the pocketbook of our middle-income families.

It is further clear, Mr. Speaker, that H. R. 6959 is wedded to the premise that our local communities do not count. Certainly, no one would deny that one of the most serious threats to both the social and economic welfare of our communities today, large and small alike, is presented by the extensive slum conditions and blight that our communities have found themselves completely unable to cope with. Again, H. R. 6959, in distinct and disheartening contrast with S. 866, contains absolutely no provision to give our cities and towns the aids they need in this connection.

And if it is any solace to our farmers, and our low-income families, and our moderate-income families, and our communities, if they do not count under H. R. 6959, neither does the veteran. It is very interesting to note in this connection that the very first two titles of H. R. 6959, as does also its title VI, contain provisions purporting to give special preferences to veterans that are not contained in S. 866.

But what kind of help is it to the millions of our veterans who need housing aid to provide, as does title I of H. R. 6959, for an occupancy preference in connection with any additional dwelling accommodations that may happen to be provided by remodeling of dwellings with FHA title I loan insurance?

What kind of aid is it to our veterans to provide—as does title II of H. R. 6959—for first preference to veterans in the disposition of permanent war housing when such preference has been in operation by administrative action since last August? What kind of aid is it to the veteran to authorize FHA to use its title VI program to insure mortgage loans on veterans' cooperative projects up to 95 percent of long-term value, when nonveterans can get a loan of 90 percent of necessary current costs?

Clearly these provisions in H. R. 6959 pay only lip service to the needs of our veterans. Yet, in return for these paltry aids, H. R. 6959 would deprive the low-income veteran who, under S. 866 would have first preference to the low-rent housing provided by that bill, of all hope for decent housing. Likewise, H. R. 6959, in return for its paltry aids, would deprive the veteran, who would get preferential treatment under the farm-housing title of S. 866, to give up his hopes for obtaining decent housing.

Even so, Mr. Speaker, the real tip-off as to how definitely the veteran does not count under H. R. 6959 is not its paltry and shabby provisions supposedly in aid of the veteran. The fact is that the necessary effect of the provisions of H. R. 6959 would be to deprive the veteran even of those aids he now has under existing law. I say this because H. R. 6959 while providing a secondary market program for FHA-insured loans, specifically refuses to provide such a program for GI first-mortgage home loans. I say this because, while H. R. 6959 authorizes an increase in interest rate on FHA-insured loans if required by the mortgage market, specifically refuses to authorize such an increase in connection with GI home loans.

Mr. Speaker, if a secondary market is necessary in connection with the FHA program where the Government insures 100 percent of principal, why is it not necessary in connection with GI home loans where the Government guarantees

only 50 percent? If an increase is necessary in connection with the interest rate on FHA-insured mortgages, why is not an interest-rate increase equally necessary on GI home-loan mortgages? And let me ask this very pertinent question that surely did not escape the sponsors of H. R. 6959, What financing institutions will, if H. R. 6959 is enacted, care to make a GI loan when it has no secondary market protection and has to be made at a 4-percent-interest rate when they will be able under H. R. 6959 to make loans under the FHA program with secondary market protection and at an interest rate 25 percent above what it can get on the GI loan? There can be only one conclusion drawn from the provisions of H. R. 6959—that they represent a deliberate attempt to sabotage the GI home-loan program.

So then, Mr. Speaker, under H. R. 6959 the farmer does not count, the low-income family does not count, the moderate-income family does not count, the local community does not count, and the veteran does not count. Who then does count?

First of all, there is the speculative builder, for H. R. 6959 would continue the FHA title VI program for another year under which the Government takes the risks and the builder takes the profit. I, too, believe that an extension of title VI is necessary, or perhaps I should say, a necessary evil. But it is one thing to provide for an extension to that title in combination with other programs which will restrict its inflationary effects and facilitate a transition from the program of emergency aids to a stabilized permanent program of housing as S. 866 does. It is quite another thing to provide for an extension of the title VI program on a basis where the primary beneficiaries are the speculative builders and the high-income families.

Who else counts? Pretty clearly also those in the high-income-tax brackets. The best indication of this is the program contained in H. R. 6959 providing for an especially high depreciation allowance on rental housing which plan would be beneficial only to those in the very high income brackets. Likewise, the 1-percent increase in interest rates provided in the bill as compared with the one-half of 1 percent increase authorized in S. 866 would not, I take it, be particularly distasteful to those who have the money to invest. And, of course, it would be the high-income families that would benefit because it would be for them that housing could continue to be produced.

Finally, of course, it is the lobbies who count under H. R. 6959—the lobbies who have so brazenly succeeded in stifling any decent housing legislation for 4 years now and who have had the audacity to make clear before the Banking and Currency Committee that they distrust the Congress because it may desire to consider the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, we have a choice between a bill that is a housing bill, and a bill that is no housing bill at all. We have a choice between a bill that is designed to provide help to those who need the help and a bill which would help those who need help the least. Let us put an end to the mockery and enact S. 866.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill is one of the most important legislative proposals introduced in the House during the entire life of the Eightieth Congress. It is important for two reasons. The first reason is found in the magnitude of the need in America for decent housing. The current housing shortage, the millions of substandard homes, and the slum conditions existing in most large cities, makes housing the No. 1 social problem in the United States. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill is also significant in that it presents a positive and constructive Federal program to correct the present acute housing shortage, and to meet America's long-run housing requirements.

I will use the few minutes at my disposal to discuss the general housing situation in the United States, and to present facts and figures to prove conclusively that Congress is obligated—in the interests of the general welfare—to approve the T-E-W housing bill. For the purpose of analysis, it is necessary to divide the housing problem into two categories: First, the immediate or emergency housing shortage; and, second, the long-run housing problem in the United States. I will begin by discussing the immediate critical housing shortage.

THREE MILLION NEW HOMES NEEDED IMMEDIATELY

All official reports indicate that America needs to build 3,000,000 new homes at once in order to place a roof over the heads of our people. Although World War II ended over 3 years ago, the housing shortage remains most critical—there are just not enough homes available to provide shelter for all the families in the United States. According to a recent estimate of the Housing Expediter, there are nearly 3,000,000 American families who are unable to find homes of their own, and are therefore forced to live doubled up with relatives and friends. The situation becomes doubly tragic when you realize that about 40 percent of these homeless families belong to veterans of World War II.

This shortage exists in nearly every metropolitan area throughout the 48 States. It is especially acute in a number of cities in my district. In Duluth, for example, there are several thousand families without homes, and it has been estimated that 20 percent of all GI families are now living doubled up with other families. Hibbing needs 800 additional housing units in order to shelter its population—a required increase of 16 percent over its present housing facilities. In Virginia, Minn., where 1 family out of every 8 is living with relatives or friends, there is a need for 500 new homes.

This lack of adequate housing prevails all over the country, and at the present rate of private home construction, it will take about 4 years for the housing supply to catch up with demand. It is upon the basis of this evidence that I maintain that Congress should enact into law the T-E-W housing bill. This bill would stimulate the building industry and speed up home construction right now when our people need additional housing so desperately.

GENERAL HOUSING CONDITIONS ARE DEPLORABLE

The general housing situation in the United States may be characterized as being most deplorable. This conclusion is supported by the evidence presented in the various housing surveys, and is backed up by the weight of authority. According to the 1940 housing census, there are some 37,000,000 dwellings in the country. Of these 37,000,000 homes, some 7,000,000, 19 percent, need major repairs; 17,000,000, 46 percent, had no private baths; 8,000,000, 22 percent, had neither gas nor electricity; 11,000,000, 30 percent, had no refrigeration; and nearly four and one-half million had neither central heating nor stoves.

Although the condition of city homes throughout the country is somewhat above the national average, yet we find two-fifths of all nonfarm dwellings are definitely substandard—38.3 percent of them either need major repairs or lack running water and other sanitary facilities. On the other hand, housing conditions in rural areas are decidedly worse than in the cities. Less than 50 percent of the 6,500,000 farm dwellings in the United States have electric lights, and only 25 percent of them have running water. According to the former Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, about two-thirds of all rural homes are substandard, and some 25 percent of them are beyond repair.

As a Member of Congress from Minnesota, I regret to report that the housing situation in Minnesota follows the national pattern. Only 75 percent of Minnesota's city homes have central heating, and less than 52 percent of them have refrigeration. Ten percent of these homes need major repairs at the present time, and about the same proportion lack running water. Rural housing in Minnesota, according to a University of Minnesota agricultural survey, follows the national rural housing parallel. Only 12 percent of the farm homes in my State have running water, less than 20 percent of them have central heating, less than 10 percent of them have refrigeration and 27 percent of farm homes need major repairs today.

A FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAM IS NEEDED

Mr. Speaker, the conditions which I have described are real—they picture the deplorable state of American homes in which we, who are citizens of the richest Nation in the world, are forced to live. They also emphasize the crying need for the Federal Government to take concrete action to meet the housing needs of the American people. This need has been estimated by the national authority as at least 15,000,000 homes to be constructed during the next 10 years—12,600,000 homes to eliminate urban substandard housing, and to provide for our increasing population, and at least 2,500,000 new homes to establish minimum housing standards for our farm population.

Of course, the real-estate lobby and other selfish interests will tell us that a

Government housing program is neither necessary nor practical. They will argue that the housing field is not the proper sphere for Government activity, and that "if private enterprise is only left alone, then the private building industry will provide all the homes necessary." But these calamity howlers ignore past experiences and the lessons of history. They forget that the rate of private construction follows the general business trend, and that while construction increases during boom periods, it falls during depression years. They ignore the fact that the private construction industry has never been able to build more than 900,000 new homes during any 1 year, and that the 1910–40 average was less than 500,000 homes per year. Even during 1947 only about 800,000 new housing units were constructed by private enterprise—at this rate it will take about 4 years to alleviate the current housing shortage.

I am not condemning the private construction industry itself for the present housing situation. But I do maintain that private enterprise cannot provide decent housing for all Americans by its own efforts, and that it needs the assistance of the Federal Government in order to do the job. This is the underlying assumption of the T-E-W bill—to provide Government financial assistance to help the private building industry construct decent homes for all Americans.

T-E-W HOUSING BILL IS MUST LEGISLATION

I am convinced that the T-E-W housing bill offers the only practical and constructive solution to America's housing needs. To furnish our people the new housing units needed to correct the present housing shortage, the bill would, if enacted into law, result in the construction of several million homes within 2 years. By providing for the construction of 15,000,000 homes during the next 10 years, it offers a plan of meeting our long-run housing needs.

In brief, this is what the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill—(S. 866 as passed by the Senate—provides: First, the authorization of $2,000,000,000 for mortgage-insurance and FHA loans to finance rental housing and private-owned homes during the next year through long-term, low-interest loans; second, the authorization of Federal funds to construct 500,000 public low-rent housing units during the next 5 years; third, the authorization of $50,000,000, in RFC loans to finance the manufacture of prefabricated homes; fourth, the authorization of $268,000,000 in loans and grants to improve substandard farm homes, with additional funds being made available for financing new farm homes and to eliminate rural slums; and, fifth, the authorization of Federal funds to finance city slum-clearance programs.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the T-E-W housing bill, as passed by the other body, provides a broad and constructive program to meet the housing requirements for America. It will provide 15,000,000 new homes during the next 10 years. It will furnish low-rent public housing for those who cannot pay rents at inflated rates. It will eliminate farm slums by furnishing funds to raise rural housing standards and build several million new farm homes. It will go far to eliminate city slums through its slum-clearance program. In my opinion, this program which the bill sets forth is the only logical answer to the housing problem in the United States.

THE COST OF FAILURE

My economy-minded colleagues tell us that America cannot afford to spend a few billion dollars for additional American homes. I say that we cannot afford not to build enough homes to furnish decent and healthy homes for all our people. Few people realize the important role that housing plays in the physical and social well-being of the Nation, nor do they realize how much less juvenile delinquency, disease and crime there is in modern housing projects as compared to slum areas.

I will mention a few statistics to prove my point. For example, the pneumonia death rate in slum areas is three times as great as it is in normal residential areas, the infant mortality rate is six times as great, and the tuberculosis rate is ten times greater in the slums than in areas where decent housing prevails. I might also mention that the crime rate in slum areas is five times greater than in the better residential areas. Although city slum areas contribute but a small part of the cities' real-estate revenues, the cost of police protection, fire protection, health and other local government services, is much greater in slum areas than in other parts of the city.

In other words, bad housing and slum conditions mean that society pays a terrific price in terms of disease, crime, and other social costs. It means that our veterans cannot find homes for their families, and that our entire population must endure the inconveniences and threats to their health which substandard housing represents. I say that America must accept the goal of a minimum standard of housing for all its people, and that the Federal Government must take the lead in achieving this goal. The cost of failure to do this is too high, and we cannot afford to pay the social costs.

CONGRESS FAILS THE PEOPLE

When the other House finally passed S. 866 on April 22, all supporters of decent housing for America were overjoyed. We were further encouraged when the House Banking and Currency Committee reported favorably on a similar housing bill last Friday, June 11, after a 14 to 13 vote. These events seemed to indicate that at long last relief for the 40 million ill-housed Americans was in sight, and that there was a good chance that Congress would enact into law the kind of housing legislation that the people need and want.

But our hopes for decent housing were short-lived—we had not taken into account the reactionary, antisocial attitudes of the Republican leadership, and the influence of the real-estate lobby upon the policies of the majority party. For yesterday's developments make it clear that the GOP leadership is not interested in any kind of housing legislation, and is now resorting to every parliamentary trick and device to block action upon the T-E-W housing bill. This is the only possible interpretation of the high-handed action of the House Rules Committee in refusing to permit this important measure to come to the floor for debate. This explains why the committee now comes forward with this emasculated housing bill (H. R. 6959) as a substitute for genuine housing legislation.

In sponsoring this so-called housing bill H. R. 6959, my Republican colleagues claim that it is a substitute for the T-E-W housing bill. An examination of its provisions, however, show that this claim is deceitful and that the bill is a fraud and a sham. All the major provisions of the T-E-W housing bill—the public housing, slum clearance, urban development, veterans' housing, and housing research features have been eliminated from this measure now under debate. This bill does nothing more than increase the authorization for FHA mortgages for the benefit of the real-estate interests and includes a few minor changes in existing law such as permitting the sale of war housing and modification of housing credit terms.

This bill is only acceptable to the selfish real-estate lobby—certainly the common people of America and the veterans who are now living in slums, shacks, trailers, or crowded into spare rooms and sleeping porches have no reason to rejoice. This bill cannot furnish our Nation with the homes we need and want. The Republican majority, in sponsoring this measure, is attempting to convince the people that the GOP is interested in housing legislation without doing anything constructive about the housing problem. In doing this, the Republicans are guilty of political fraud—they are breaking their pledges to the veterans, and they are betraying the welfare of the people in favor of selfish real-estate interests.

I refuse to become a part of this gigantic hoax—I will not support this measure that represents a sell-out of the common people whose housing needs are being neglected.

I call upon the Members of the House to vote down this sham so-called housing bill, H. R. 6959, and demand that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, as passed by the Banking and Currency Committee, be brought up for consideration and final vote.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the last section of H. R. 6959 removes for 1 year the duty on imports of plywood. I am strongly opposed to this provision because I feel that it will result in discrimination against the plywood industry. If the duties were removed it would make it impossible for the plywood industry of my State to compete with foreign plywood industries because of the great disparity in costs. Furthermore, the suspension of the duty is unnecessary and inadvisable in view of the domestic industry's increased and increasing production to meet domestic requirements. It is estimated that where heretofore the

industry production was 29,000,000 feet per week it has currently been increased to 35,000,000 feet per week. When new plants now being constructed are completed it is estimated that the production will be 40,000,000 feet before the end of this year. This should relieve any existing shortages of plywood for housing purposes.

Under the suspension of rules I appreciate that the bill cannot now be amended. It is my hope that this section of the bill will, therefore, be removed in conference.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the housing bill now under consideration.

As I have indicated for some time, and as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] well knows because of my conversations with him, I favor the enactment of housing legislation embodying the principle incorporated in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I can agree somewhat with the position of the gentleman from Michigan with respect to relying upon private industry to build the great majority of homes which are needed so badly. However, I would call to his attention, and I would like to emphasize that Federal aid to States and municipalities to construct decent living quarters for persons in the low-income groups and in slum areas is nothing new.

It appears that the bill before the House, which unquestionably has much merit, will be the only housing measure to come before the House. It does not look as if we will have an opportunity to vote on the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, nor does it look as if there would come before the House the Rogers bill, the Veterans' Homestead Act, which was approved unanimously by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This is regrettable. Both of these measures are worthy of consideration by the Congress.

Notwithstanding the fact that private industry is now building houses in unprecedented numbers, unless private builders are able to construct habitable living quarters which can be rented at reasonable rates, then the Congress must at the next session meet this issue and enact necessary legislation to provide such homes.

The veterans throughout the country living in temporary makeshift housing projects want decent homes in which to live—I know whereof I speak because in my district there are probably more veterans in these projects than in any other district in the United States. Unless homes are forthcoming, these veterans will look to the Congress at the next session for the immediate passage of adequate legislation which will provide sufficient housing.

MILLIONAIRE BONUS HOUSING BILL WITHOUT HOUSING

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill should not be called a housing bill. It might better be called the millionaires' bonus housing bill, without any housing. It is a subsidy bill for the real-estate interests, with tax exemptions and bonuses that have no place in this bill. There is not a word in the bill that will even tend to clear a single slum area or build a single multiple dwelling for the housing of low-income groups.

The manner in which this bill is foisted upon this Congress is a travesty upon our American traditions.

A bill providing for public housing and slum clearance, both rural and urban, and for housing research, was reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee by a majority vote, and the committee chairman instructed to obtain a rule from the Rules Committee to bring the matter before the House for consideration and action. Instead of following the instructions of the Banking and Currency Committee, its chairman urged the Rules Committee to prevent consideration of the bill. When the Rules Committee by a vote of 6 to 2 acceded to his request he then conceived the idea of foisting this bill upon the Congress.

The bill was introduced on the 16th of June. At 8 o'clock that night some of the members of the committee were advised of an executive session to be held at 9 o'clock the following morning, and other members did not get notice until after 9 o'clock on June 17 that the committee was meeting in executive session to consider this bill. Although at least a half dozen members of the committee sought recognition for various purposes, including the offering of amendments to the bill, the chairman could hear and see no one except the member with whom he had arranged in advance to present a motion to vote the bill out. The motion was entertained and forced through without permitting anyone to say a single word about the bill. Not only was no discussion called for, but none was permitted. And now we are asked to pass this bill under a suspension of the rules of the House, permitting a total of 40 minutes of debate, 20 minutes of which are controlled by the chairman of the committee and without any right to offer a single amendment to the bill or a motion to recommit the bill. Those tactics alone warrant the defeat of a motion to suspend the rules and to pass the bill.

In my district, city, and State the public-housing and slum-clearance provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill are not political issues. They have the almost unanimous support of every person in every walk of life, regardless of their political leanings.

Borough President John Cashmore, Mayor William O'Dwyer and Governor Thomas E. Dewey, have all indicated their all-out support for those provisions. Every veteran, religious, and fraternal group in my State favors the enactment of such legislation. Yet a small handful of men in this Congress are preventing the Congress from considering and acting upon those measures, and are arrogating to themselves the powers of a dictator.

If there was merit in their opposition, and if they genuinely felt they were right, they would have no hesitancy in letting this Congress debate the issues and vote upon them. The entire Republican Party, unfortunately, must be compelled to bear the consequences of this ill-considered action on the part of its leadership in this House.

The American public is too smart to be fooled by the passage of a bill labeled a housing bill, that is not a housing bill, that is nothing more nor less than a rich man's subsidy bill and which denies the American public the relief to which it is entitled.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress with the purpose of assisting, in every way possible, in the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. For 2 years, week after week and month after month, I have been meeting and conferring with other Members of this body, who also are interested in the passage of a proper housing bill. It therefore comes as a grave disappointment to me that we have only this type of a housing bill before us.

Many of us have had intimate knowledge of the powerful forces lobbying against the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill but having set ourselves to the task, we were able to overcome their influence in the Committee on Banking and Currency, where this legislation has been sleeping for the past 3 years.

Just a few days ago a majority of the Banking and Currency Committee—yes, all of the Democrats and three Republicans—reported a bill incorporating the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill out of that committee. The forces blocking this legislation for 3 years were given a tremendous set-back. That fine housing bill then proceeded in the normal manner to the Rules Committee, where we had every reason to expect that in the normal course of events a rule would have been granted and the bill soon would have been brought forth on the floor for debate and vote. How foolish we were to expect that the opponents of this measure would cease their fight. Their activity increased, and great pressure was brought to bear upon the Rules Committee itself. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. WOLCOTT, of Michigan, the chief opponent to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, led the fight in the Rules Committee against the majority report of his own committee.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the opponents were successful for I am reliably informed that by a vote of six to two, the Rules Committee refused to grant this splendid housing bill a rule, and back it went to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Another amazing part of this story is that the chairman of that committee, the same Mr. WOLCOTT, then brought forth his own bill and submitted it to the committee for consideration. This bill is the bill which has the approval of the powerful lobby of which I have just spoken. As Mr. Wolcott, the chairman, presented this watered-down housing bill to his committee, the Democratic members were prohibited from amending or objecting to the present bill in any manner whatsoever. The debate on this measure reveals that the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee refused to recognize any of the Democratic members during the entire session of that committee. Hence we have the bill before us in its present form.

But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. Does the present bill come to us through the Rules Committee? Does it come to us under a rule permitting the membership of this great body either to amend it on the floor of this House or as a last resort to move to reconsider this measure? The answer is clearly "no." The answer is "no," Mr. Speaker, because the chairman of that committee and the Republican leadership who support this legislative maneuver do not want the people to know where they stand on the vital items which have been stricken out of this bill now under consideration. They do not want to go on record as showing where the Republican Party stands or each Republican Member of this House stands on the questions of rural housing, slum clearance, and public housing.

So, here we are again, Mr. Speaker, voting an important measure under a suspension of the rules which neither permits an amendment nor a motion to reconsider. In my opinion this is the rankest kind of political cowardice.

I can appreciate a difference of opinion on this important subject and I do not condemn those who may not agree with me, but I have an utter contempt for any individual who is unwilling to record his stand for the information of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this procedure in the hope that the leadership of this body will be compelled to bring forth the housing bill recommended by a majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Clearly, if this present bill is voted down, there is ample time for the Republican leadership and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to do one of two things. As I have indicated, they may again present to the Rules Committee the bill which was first reported out by a majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency or, and of equal importance, they may take the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill which was passed recently by the Senate and is now in the Committee on Banking and Currency. I repeat, there is ample time for either of these bills to be presented to this body before adjournment, should the pending measure be voted down.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation want a housing bill. They are entitled to a housing program. If given an opportunity the Members of this body will join with the Senate of the United States in giving them a housing program. Only political and legislative chicanery will prevent the enactment of adequate housing legislation.

The present bill is a fraud and a subterfuge. It adds nothing to a program for housing legislation. Actually, the important provisions of this bill already have been passed by this body. These other housing bills now are resting in the Senate. The reason for that is that the Senate has incorporated most of their provisions in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which was passed by the Senate with a substantial majority. It is that bill of which I have spoken which now rests in the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Speaker, there has been entirely too much talk about socialism in connection with the housing bill. Everyone of any intelligence knows that Senator TAFT, whatever else he may be, is not a Socialist. Certainly Governor Dewey is not a Socialist. In fact, most of the outstanding leaders of this Nation are in favor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Therefore, let us stop this childish talk about the danger of traveling along the road to socialism. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to your attention that a proper housing program can lend strength to the moral fabric of this Nation. The lack of proper housing facilities not only has cost this Nation billions of dollars in the suppression of crime, juvenile delinquency, etc., but great moral problems have arisen from the increase in divorces which, too, has a bearing on the problem of juvenile delinquency.

And fundamentally, there is that problem of satisfying the needs of our people and overcoming the bitter resentment of veterans—two or three millions of them who have been looking for homes now for almost 3 years.

If this pending measure passes, those of us who have worked so hard and so long can only hope that the Republican leadership in the Senate of the United States may strike from this bill all below the enacting clause and include the original provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, eventually reporting the same to this body for a record vote. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility rests with the Republican leadership and unless a proper housing program is forthcoming from this Congress, it will be an issue you will have to meet again and again in the coming campaign.

HOUSING BILL A FRAUD

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, this so-called housing bill is a fraud on the American people which alone is enough to insure defeat for the present Republican majority in Congress at the hands of an aroused country.

Furthermore, the ignominious methods used in jamming the bill through the House prove the utter and cynical bankruptcy of the Republican leadership.

The malodorous deal is proof irrefutable that there is no Republican Party, but only a collection of factions struggling for the privilege of outraging public interest.

The House Republican faction has disowned the Senate leadership flagrantly, publicly, and maliciously, by the instrumentality of this bill. The political implications are obvious, and to Democrats hilarious.

But to 12,000,000 Americans seeking shelter at prices within their reach, this farce is rank tragedy.

The bill makes it impossible for a private real-estate operator to lose money.

It makes it equally impossible for the ordinary ex-GI or common citizen to gain a decent place to live.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to socialized housing in this country, and I shall support this bill which, in my opinion, will be a great aid to private construction.

The improvement of our critical housing situation should not be crippled by a nationalized building program.

This legislation increases mortgage insurance authority by $1,600,000,000, which should encourage increased building by individuals and help thousands of veterans as well as other individuals to finance their own homes.

Since the Eightieth Congress removed controls from building materials some 835,000 dwelling units were completed in 1947, which is almost double the number constructed in 1946. Three hundred and fifty-six thousand homes were started the first 5 months of this year and every indication points to the construction of 1,000,000 homes this year which will be an all-time record.

I am sure that this legislation will be particularly helpful in the solving of our housing problem.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the proposed housing bill does not include any provision for low-rent public housing or slum clearance. As a matter of simple justice, I cannot be satisfied with a housing program which would aid all groups of our citizenry except the very one most in need of it. On July 24, 1947, the Congress, by Concurrent Resolution No. 104, created a Joint Committee on Housing with instructions to conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of housing. This committee was composed of seven Members of the House and seven of the Senate, appointed from the respective Committees on Banking and Currency. This committee during the summer, fall, and early winter of 1947 conducted hearings in all the principal cities from Boston, Mass., to San Francisco, Calif. I recall attending the hearing held at Boston and the one in New Haven, Conn. Volumes of testimony have been taken concerning the situation and hardly a week passes that one does not receive the printed record of the proceedings held in some city in this country. The joint resolution provided that this committee should report to the Congress not later than March 15, 1948, the result of its finding, and on that day, the gentleman from New York, Hon. RALPH GAMBLE, chairman of the committee, submitted a final majority report, which is a matter of record. In this report certain conclusions and recommendations were made, and I particularly call attention to recommendation No. 13, reading as follows:

Provision should be made now for Federal aid to local communities to enable them to undertake the clearance of their slums and blighted areas so as to make such areas available for redevelopment with the active participation of private enterprise. For this purpose, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator should be authorized to undertake a program of loan and subsidy assistance to communities. This program should be wholly distinct and separate from the low-rent public-housing program. The subsidy should be on a capital-grant basis and should involve a sharing of the net costs of slum clearance between the Federal Government and local communities on a 2-to-1 matching basis. As an initial program, the Administrator should be authorized to make, over the next 5-year period, $1,000,000,000 in loans, repayable with interest, and $500,000,000 in subsidy commitments, at the rate of $100,000, a year. Such a program should be authorized immediately in order to make posible the preparatory steps necessary in connection with such a program.

And recommendation No. 14, reading as follows:

Provision should be made for assistance to local communities under the United States Housing Act of 1937 for the provision over a period of the next 5 years of a maximum of 500,000 units of low-rent public housing for families of low income with (1) additional safeguards written into the act to increase local responsibility, make sure that tenancy is restricted to low-income families, and avoid any competition with private housing; (2) preference to the families of veterans and servicemen for a period of 5 years; (3) revision of the applicable cost limitations, which have not been revised since the original act of 1937, so as to bring them in line with current housing costs; (4) shortening the period for the payment of annual contributions from 60 years to 40 years; (5) an increase of the rate of maximum Federal contribution by 1 percent per annum of development cost, which increase will be more than compensated for by the shortened period over which Federal contributions can be paid; (6) provision that, in the event of a major default by a local authority in its contractual obligations, the Public Housing Authority may take over a low-rent housing project until such default is cured, and may continue to pay annual contributions not in excess of the original amount contracted for; and (7) revision of the present $800,000,000 borrowing authorization of PHA to make it clear that amounts repaid are available for reloaning.

(It is believed that with the aid of the financing amendments recommended above it would be possible for local authorities to sell bonds to private investors covering substantially the entire cost of low-rent projects and at a substantial saving in interest costs as compared with the cost of borrowing from the Government. The reduction in interest rate, estimated to be approximately one-half of 1 percent per annum, would permit more rapid amortization of bonds, and combined with the shorter period during which bonds are outstanding, should result in a very great decrease in total interest costs.)

Attention was called to the undisputable fact that in the spring of 1947 there were 2,800,000 families living doubled up with other families, the vast majority forced to accept unsatisfactory living arrangements because of the acute housing shortage. An additional 500,000 families are living in temporary housing, trailers, rooming houses, and other makeshift accommodations. The committee stressed the urgency of the housing shortage and the necessity for prompt and effective action by the Congress. The note of urgency so deeply pervaded the local hearings held by this committee that no summation or analysis of these hearings would possibly be considered an accurate reflection of them without clear-cut emphasis of this fact. This was true whether the testimony was with respect to our northern, southern, eastern or western communities; our urban or rural areas; the needs of our veterans, minority groups, or our people generally; or the needs of our low-income or middle-income families.

The committee also recognized that this problem was one that could not be solved by State and local governments alone, and that Federal financial assistance to our communities was imperative, and stated as follows:

This note of urgency, struck over and over again throughout the course of the hearings, indicates clearly that the housing situation has been so serious in our communities generally, and that the pressures upon our State and local governments to act have therefore been so great, that there can be little doubt as to the intense desire and determination of our local communities and officials to assist in meeting the housing problem to the best of their abilities. They are especially concerned with two major problem areas—the clearance and redevelopment of slums and blighted areas and the provision of decent housing for low-income families now living in slums. Nevertheless, these matters are entirely beyond their control and beyond their financial capacities. Senator Wagner's report summarizes the ample evidence attesting these facts. It is clear that we cannot deal effectively with these deep-rooted phases of the housing problems without adequate Federal financial assistance to our communities for such purposes. It is clear also from the overwhelming evidence that these phases of the housing problem are of such magnitude and seriousness that adequate solutions depend on treating them as part of the housing problem.

Whether it be with respect to Boston, or New York, or Jacksonville, or Birmingham, or Cleveland, or Chicago, or Louisville, or Seattle, reports from source after source have been almost monotonously similar. The well-being of our local communities is threatened by the excessive fiscal and social costs of our slums and blighted areas. The hearings and studies of this committee have served only to corroborate the evidence of survey after survey made over the years, national and local alike, that the bad-housing areas, the social-problem areas, the areas of relatively high municipal costs, and the areas of relatively low returns, are practically identical.

The committee concluded that—

Local self-government is a cherished part of our democratic process. From this fact, however, it is entirely specious to argue that the problems of housing for families of low income and slum clearance must be the responsibility of our localities alone, with the Federal Government in the role of an onlooker. The simple fact is that it is largely because these special problems have proved so entirely beyond the capacity of our local governments that the situation has become as acute as it has.

This joint committee also concluded that it was evident that the home-building industry is providing homes which only the higher income families can afford and seems to indicate that the only feasible solution of this question is by the Federal subsidy.

In Connecticut we have a particularly severe housing problem because of our greatly increased population, particularly in the former defense industrial areas, and this is particularly true in New Haven in my congressional district. Thousands of persons who came to Connecticut to be employed in defense industry during the war remained as they liked our State so well. During recent months in Connecticut, the problem has rapidly become even more serious. In 1946 an estimated 25,000 new housing units were needed. The need today is estimated at some 40,000. In New Haven alone, there are some 1,400 families who are seeking shelter in low-rent housing units. While private industry has done a great job, at the same time it is evident that it is now providing homes which only the higher income families can afford and this seems to indicate that the only feasible solution to this question is by Federal subsidy.

It has been suggested most sincerely that federally financed low-rent housing and slum clearances are "socialistic." I cannot agree. If this is so, then the majority of the Members of Congress comprising the Joint Housing Committee have gone socialistic. I doubt very much if it will be accepted by the veterans and the persons who are without a roof over their heads at the present time. Nor do I believe that they will be very much impressed by the argument of the excessive cost of such a program. In this connection we have recently embarked upon a program for the relief and rehabilitation of the peoples of 16 foreign nations wherein we will build shelter for them and even furnish them with tobacco and it has not been suggested that this is socialistic or that it is un-American.

I shall vote for the Wolcott bill, not because I am satisfied with it, but so that we may have a housing bill that will go to the Senate for conference in the hope that as a result thereof, the conferees may agree on a housing bill which will establish a long-range housing policy, and relieve the intolerable conditions which now prevail.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr Speaker, certain groups in this country have been demanding enactment of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. I could not support that measure in the form that it reached the House for the reason that it is based on socialistic principles.

Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to lend my support, however, to the Wolcott bill, H. R. 6959, which in my opinion will meet the pressing demands for housing in the American way. Clearly, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill would put Government in the housing business to the detriment of private enterprise which has a building record unsurpassed in the history of this country. The basis for the Taft bill is, in my opinion, socialistic in that the Government would take over and superimpose itself upon private building if the building industry fails to meet a given situation which would arise in the minds of the bureaucrats administering the program.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely interesting to note that private enterprise last year built 835,100 units and it is estimated that it will build more than a million units this year. When the Government was in the building business under the so-called Wyatt housing program and controlled all of the items that went into housing and with several billions of dollars from the Government it produced only 437,800 units. It is a further fact that when the Government had the power to command the channeling of every inch and every ounce of building materials that went into the home-building field its record for building homes was a miserable one. It cannot be said that private enterprise in the building field has failed. In fact it has an unbelievable record of achievement; it is building many homes today.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the provisions of H. R. 6959 the bill contains provisions which make it possible to build houses to meet a continuing emergency without calling upon the Government to finance public projects to the extent of

some $6,000,000,000. It has been rightfully said that a Government housing program would be expensive for the taxpayers, it would raise the cost of houses where the so-called little man could not purchase them, and it would certainly add to the inflationary spiral.

And further, Mr. Speaker, if we are to adopt the principles of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which are based upon a socialistic principle that Government must step in when private enterprise does not meet a situation, it is reasonable to believe that once Government monopolized the building field it would be justified to move into any field where shortages occur on the theory that private enterprise had failed. Today there is a shortage in automobiles. Is it contended that Government should step in and take over the automobile industry of this country? There is a shortage of coal. Does the same principle apply there? Many other instances might be cited but certainly we have not reached the point in this country where we must resort to socialism; when government steps in to meet production shortages. Such a program is un-American. In effect, the Wolcott housing bill says to the building industry of this country: "Go ahead and do this job; we will lend whatever assistance we can in the field of financing, but the job is yours." The general purposes of the bill are designed to meet the needs for low-cost housing, rental housing, and continuance of veterans' preference under title 6 of the National Housing Act, and in the disposition of Government-owned permanent war housing. Further, it provides a secondary market for insured FHA mortgages and GI guaranteed home loans.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and meets the problem in the good old American way.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are two real and cogent objections that must be lodged against this bill being brought in today in this comprehensible way. In the first place, the methods being used to gag and bind not only a legislative committee of this Congress, but the entire membership by forcing this bill through without amendment, without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t," and to deny the legislative Representatives of the people of America even to stand up and be counted on such a vital issue as housing alone would be reason enough for defeating this bill.

The dictatorial methods, used by the Republican leadership, and the usurpation of authority belonging to a legislative committee by the Republican controlled Rules Committee, should be enough to defeat this use of the most vicious form of "gag" rule being practiced on the House in bringing this legislation to the floor under rules suspension.

That should be enough to defeat this bill, but even a greater and more compelling reason for defeating it is the plain fact that it is a complete phony, as far as housing legislation is concerned.

I want to elaborate on that. The only thing in this bill that will actually and genuinely help get houses for the millions in this country who are crying desperately for a place to live is title VI of FHA. Title VI has passed this House long ago and has been pending in the Senate since March 24 of this year. The bill can be passed by the Senate today or tomorrow and become law. That extends $2,000,000,000 worth of FHA insurance under title VI, which the chairman of the committee will admit has been the most useful instrument of getting housing. The other portion of this bill is the sale of Lanham war permanent housing, which also passed the House and has been pending in the Senate since June 19, 1947. So almost three-fourths of this bill, the part that will get housing, has already been passed by the House.

It is not going to do any good to pass it two times or three times or four times through the same House. It has to go through the other House before it becomes a law.

The main issue before the House is the question of what Federal aids are going to be given to the housing, Federal aids in the nature of a subsidy, if you please.

By dictation of the Republican leadership of the House and by dictation of the Republican control of the Rules Committee of the House they have decided that the poorest and most underprivileged class of people in the United States, the people who hopelessly live in America's slums, cannot get any subsidies to improve their housing conditions, even under a locally managed program administered by the cities themselves.

So they have killed out all the subsidies to these underprivileged people—those for decent farm housing and veterans—but have left in the bill the subsidies for the people who are best able to pay their own way—these investors.

There is not one dime of subsidies that will reach the underprivileged but there are millions if not hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of subsidy that will go to the rich investors. Let me elaborate.

This bill contains the best worked out tax dodge I have ever seen come before this Congress. If you are a wealthy man, you can insure a $500,000 apartment house built under FHA insurance up to 90 or 100 percent of its actual cost. Thus the wealthy investor is protected by this insurance at about 100 percent. Then what tax advantage do you give on that $500,000 house? Get this clear. You write off $250,000 of depreciation on the $500,000 investment in 5 years under tax exemptions for fast depreciation. That is in the report. Have you ever seen a better tax dodge than that? This is what the Treasury says it amounts to. If you have an income of $500,000 a year you have a tax dodge of better than $41,000 a year, $210,000 in the 5-year period, out of Uncle Sam's pocket. Subsidies? No subsidies for the underprivileged people in the slums but a nice fat subsidy for the "barefoot" millionaires that are looking for a way to beat Uncle Sam's tax. You get 100-percent insurance on your investment and then a write-off of 50-percent depreciation during 5 years.

This bill also contains a so-called yield-insurance provision, further designed to subsidize the big investor, as well as guaranteeing him against loss. No subsidies for the slum dweller, but always for the investor.

One of the strangest and most unusual procedures, however, is contained in the so-called FHA mortgage support market under the Federal National Mortgage Association. For several years this agency furnished a secondary market, where holders of mortgages could sell them, at par, to the Government corporation. The operation has netted a big profit to the Government.

But under this strange section, for the first time I believe in our history, the Congress is deliberately depressing the market on Government-insured mortgages. Instead of offering a secondary market for FHA or GI loans at par, this bill announces to the world that they are only worth 98 cents on the dollar. They will not be purchased by the Government for what the Government insurance says they are worth—for Congress under this bill says they are worth to us only 98 cents on the dollar.

Already this hastily conceived and ill-considered move has caused a wholesale withdrawal of investors from the home mortgage market—as well as threaten many builders with bankruptcy.

The net effect of this 98 cents on the dollar provision is the same as if the Federal Reserve banking system announced tomorrow that it would support the Government bond market at only 98 cents on the dollar. Do any of you think that the market would not immediately decline to the figure that Government itself set?

Thus it will be with this provision, which wrecks, instead of helps, the market for Government-insured FHA title VI loans.

Other provisions of this same section, changes without notice, financial aids which builders have for the past two or more years relied upon to build large-scale housing projects.

Conscientious builders, who heeded the Government's plea for large-scale production of housing, now find themselves faced with bankruptcy because the bill here denies them access to a ready Federal market.

This bill provides that unless a mortgage was insured after June 19, these Government-guaranteed mortgages cannot be marketed. With the confusion created by the introduction of this bill existing in the mortgage market, insurance companies and other investors have stopped buying title VI mortgages. Why should they, when the Congress is depressing the value of their mortgages by legislative action?

And so these builders, who relied on our good faith in building these houses, now find themselves heavily indebted to banks on short-time interim financing for construction, without a market to rely on when the house is completed.

This is a dangerous provision and one that you will live to regret. Already it has set the housing program back heavily—and if this bill becomes law, will further retard home financing.

In addition, it is certain to force up by 1 or 2 percent the cost of financing

these veterans' homes because of the uncertainty that has already been created.

In the bill killed by the Republican leadership yesterday, and on which you in the House were denied the right to vote upon, provision was made for a secondary market for GI home-building loans under the GI bill of rights. The bill here today strips away this help for the veteran and throws him a crumb.

Only an infinitesimal amount of help is given him on his financing problem—that of being able to have his second-mortgage GI loan eligible for the Federal secondary-market support. This, under the FHA combination loan, amounts to only 10 percent of the cost of his house.

Unless the veteran's house is built in a large community or in a neighborhood acceptable to the FHA authorities, he is denied completely any help on this score. The net effect of striking this valuable veterans' provision from the original bill, as was done in this new bill, is to deny any Government help to the veteran who wants to build on the farm, or in the small rural community. This is completely a housing bill for the cities and the rural people of America are being left out completely from any help in their housing problems.

All in all, this bill is so bad that it should be overwhelmingly defeated. There is still time to enact a general housing bill—one that will help all—the slum dwellers, the farmers, and veterans, as well as investors who ask tax subsidies to build our much-needed housing.

More than $6,000,000,000 in housing insurance has been provided for city dwellers—but the record does not reveal where one house has been so aided on a farm or in the small rural communities.

The issue here today is, whether you want to pass one-sided legislation to help only investors, or whether you want a genuine all-around housing bill.

If this bill is voted down under suspension of the rules, it can be brought back immediately under a rule, and can be open for amendments to correct the glaring defects. The tax dodge can be taken out, and help for farm and slum housing written in. And above all—the Congress can be counted on a roll-call vote so that everyone can see just where every Member stands on providing effective, rather than phony, housing legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I expect to support this bill. I am supporting it because I know that unless this bill passes we will have no housing legislation. There are some things in the bill to which I am opposed. I was one of the most active advocates, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, seeking to bring to the floor of this House a comprehensive bill involving practically all of the main issues relative to meeting the housing shortage. I think the Members of the House were entitled to have these matters thoroughly discussed, so by amendment they could add other provisions to the bill seeking to help solve the housing shortage or strike out any unwise provisions. Public housing and slum clearance have been an issue for some time, and I think the Members on the floor of this House should have an opportunity to settle this issue once and for all. It is regrettable that this bill cannot be amended in any form, under the rule by which it is being considered, nor can a motion be made to recommit the bill, but this is water over the dam, and to vote against the bill, as I have stated, means the end of housing legislation this session, as I see it.

Over in the other House, under the rules of that body a Member may offer an amendment and speak as long as he desires on it, so by voting for this bill there is a chance of getting some bill that would aid in solving the housing problem.

The housing problem affects every family in the United States directly or indirectly, and with the chance of this bill remedying the housing shortage I do not see how I could vote against the bill. I must say that I am certainly against the procedure under which this bill reached the floor of the House. The original Wolcott bill was reported out of the committee by a vote of 14 to 13, and the Rules Committee refused to give a rule. Then the Banking and Currency Committee was reconvened and the present Wolcott bill was voted out by the committee and none of the Democrats were given a chance to offer any amendment.

The present bill extends title VI of the Federal Housing Administration under which more than 40 percent of our housing has been constructed during the last year, and we will at least get this much out of this bill, and if amended in the Senate, it may be perfected to be more effective in solving the housing problem and a chance for the House to express itself on slum clearance and public housing. I think the question of taxes raised in this bill is bad and probably this will be eliminated in the other body or if brought to a conference.

Title III of the bill is not very effective for a secondary market, especially for GI loans. I advocated and introduced the first amendment in my committee in 1946 which became a law creating a secondary market for GI loans in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I offered an amendment to the first Wolcott bill which was adopted, and the entire bill was adopted later on by the committee, and this is the bill that the Rules Committee tabled. I had an amendment prepared yesterday to this effect and intended to offer it when the present Wolcott bill was considered, but I was not given an opportunity to present it. This proposed amendment was fair and equitable. It involved no cost to the Government. It meant that the promises contained in the GI bill of rights could be kept. It was approved not only by the House Banking and Currency Committee in H. R. 6888 but by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House.

A united veterans' organization was earnestly asking our support of this provision. Are we going to say that the promise made by this Government in 1944 to the men and women fighting for this country is an empty promise? It will be unless a secondary market is created for the GI loans. Since July 1, 1947, when the secondary market was withdrawn, it has been very difficult for the veterans to secure loans to build houses in many places of this country. So I say that in hope of the other body or the conferees of both bodies improving the situation I do not see how I could afford to vote against the present bill. Without it there would be no other chance of any housing bill at this session.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a conglomerate collection of previous titles that we have already sent over to the other body. For example, H. R. 5854 and H. R. 3492, and S. 2287—now Public Law 548. A good many Members here today have been led to believe, and a member of the committee who spoke before me has said that in order to have a continuation of title VI you would have to support this legislation, H. R. 6959. We have passed and sent to the other body the bill H. R. 5854 for the sum of $2,000,000,000. In this legislation today the difference between a temporary extension of some $400,000,000 that was cleared through the other side, and which is now a public law, was deducted from the so-called Wolcott bill, H. R. 6959, now under consideration. So do not be deluded into believing that if you do not vote for this bill you will not have an extension of title VI. The other body has had this legislation before it. It has not acted as yet. Just because you happen to vote for this legislation again today does not necessarily mean that they will take up this particular legislation. The gentleman from Oklahoma has pointed out to you the feature known as the fast tax amortization plan. That, of course, is a plan that will be of benefit to speculative builders. The guise is, of course, the offering of an opportunity to dodge the tax. If we were operating under an open rule we could question whether or not it is germane. Then we have another come-on in this legislation known as the yield insurance, which is a come-on for financial institutions or insurance companies to build in a particular price class.

To present this bill as a housing bill is a travesty. It is in reality a bill to offer financial aids to private enterprisers in the building business. It is a boon to home financing, with Government subsidy. Who will benefit by this legislation? Certainly not the farmer—not the communities, not the low-income families—not the moderate income families—not the veteran. The provisions for these groups are shabby and paltry. The bill frustrates one who appreciates the needs of the Nation for an over-all comprehensive housing program. But it certainly appeals to the speculative builders and those in the high income-tax brackets, and especially the real-estate lobby. All the "fat cats" of the industry will benefit. Those who need the help will benefit least, and those who need help the least will benefit most.

It is a shallow gesture at housing legislation and a mockery on this House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a sham and a delusion. To pass it would be a vain and futile thing. To begin with, its principal provisions have already been passed by the House of Representatives and are pigeonholed in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

If we pass it this afternoon, one of two things will happen. It will either be repigeonholed in that committee or it will be brought up on the floor of the Senate where S. 866 will be substituted therefor. So the net result of all the debate, the net result of all the hard work by the joint committee, made up of the House and Senate, seven Senators and seven Representatives, is that the veterans of this country, the people of this country, the farms of this country, and the cities of this country, when this Congress adjourns tomorrow night, will not have any housing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of the Banking Committee and of the Rules Committee for their success in denying to this House the opportunity to vote on a comprehensive housing bill. Last Thursday the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee stated that a majority of this House would vote for a comprehensive housing bill if it was presented to them. He stated that the only hope was that the Rules Committee would refuse to let the House vote on such a bill. He has succeeded in his maneuver.

I think the Members of this House will want to know just what is included in the comprehensive bill which the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Rules Committee have so successfully blocked. Every Member ought to know what the American people think of this bill—in terms of their needs for homes in which to live as Americans should, in which children can get a fair start in life and which will provide the aspirations which all of us must have to make life worth living. I am thinking of the needs of nearly 3,000,000 families who do not have any homes at all, but are crowded in, most of them involuntarily, with their in-laws and other families and of the 500,000 families living in trailers, rooming houses, temporary housing and other makeshift accommodations. I am thinking of the needs of more than 5,000,000 families in cities and surrounding areas, whose homes fall below decent standards for living. I am thinking also of the families on the farms whose homes are shacks which should be replaced or, at a minimum, need major repairs in order to make them livable. I am not even counting the great majority of farm homes which do not have the sanitary facilities which have become so essential for safe living in our cities, even though I deplore the lower housing standards we seem to accept for farm people.

Not even the best housing legislation we could enact is going to solve the housing problem for 10,000,000 families overnight. That is why we must consider legislation that looks ahead into the future, and not try to solve a long-range problem with short-run emergency measures. It is obvious that when you extend the solution of present problems into the future, you are also going to have to take into account the future increase in demand, losses in supply and the deterioration of additional housing to the point where it should be replaced. And finally, in order to bring about a normal relationship between needs and supply, it is important that there is a sufficient amount of housing available for rent or sale to give American families some flexibility within their price range and to make it possible for them to move about without having to be plagued with the difficulties of obtaining housing or being separated for long intervals.

Now what are the facts about housing needs? I know of no better place to turn to than the majority report filed just last March by the Joint Committee on Housing which was created by this Congress to study the housing problem. I think this House should know that while a few members of the committee dissented on a few of its recommendations, there was no disagreement with the findings reached after executive hearings in Washington and 32 other cities, after careful studies by individual members. I should add that these findings corroborated earlier conclusions reached by other committees, particularly the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment in 1945 and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1946 and 1947, and that its estimates of need were determined after careful consideration of other estimates from a variety of sources. Data obtained from the Bureau of the Census reports as to population and housing inventory provide the basis of these estimates of need.

Putting aside farm needs for the moment, America will need 15,441,000 new homes by 1960 to provide decent homes for the 39,500,000 families which the Bureau of the Census estimates we will have by that time. That means 1,285,000 homes a year. Discounting the considerable number of farm dwellings that can be rehabilitated, we shall need 200,000 farm homes a year, bringing the total up to 1,500,000 new houses annually.

It will take over 7,000,000 nonfarm homes, or more than 600,000 units a year, just to bring the present supply up to the shelter requirements of American families, and to provide a 4 percent effective vacancy rate. Before the war, real estate people used to think the supply was normal when 5 percent vacancies existed. That is about all we have been doing in this country for the last quarter of a century. Over the long pull, housing construction has just been keeping ahead of the increase in number of families. We have done practically nothing to replace the slums, to replace the losses from fire, demolition, and floods. That is all we will do during the coming years if we do not make a comprehensive attack on the housing problem through effective legislation. If that is all we do, we will have more, instead of fewer slums, for houses wear out every year. As one witness before the Banking and Currency Committee observed, a house begins to deteriorate the minute it is finished.

If we really meet America's housing needs, if we really want to eliminate the slums that imperil the health and morale of several million of our people, we are going to need another 8,000,000 homes during the next 12 years, or nearly 700,000 homes a year, to provide replacements for urban and suburban slum dwellings which are presently, or will become, substandard, for dwellings lost by fire, demolition, and floods and for temporary dwellings, most of them built during the war for only short-time use.

This Congress will be neglecting its responsibility to the American people if it does not create the tools for reaching the larger housing goal set forth in the joint committee's report. We can no longer tolerate, in this Nation, bad housing conditions which are a financial drain on the communities, which sap the energies of the people, which deprive them of the incentives that a wholesome home life provides and which create conditions in which crime and delinquency are bred.

Despite the findings of the joint committee and of other congressional committees, there are still those who say we can solve this housing problem without enacting comprehensive housing legislation. Despite the record of festering urban slums and dreary rural shacks, there are those who say that if Government will just let things alone—except provide a little credit assistance—everything will work out all right.

I am conscious of the record that the private building industry has built up since the war. I hope that private builders will start a record-breaking million homes this year, as everything seems to indicate. I am in favor of the credit aids from the Federal Government which are contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which will help them achieve and maintain that record.

But I see nothing in the present situation that offers the hope that even with these credit aids, the private building industry will be able to achieve and maintain the production necessary to fill the enlarged goals that have been envisioned by the Joint Committee on Housing. Neither does the joint committee.

Let us take a look at the record. The previous peak in home building was reached 23 years ago, way back in 1925, when 937,000 dwelling units were started. Then construction began to slide down, helping to take the whole economy with it, until, in 1933, 93,000 homes, only 10 percent of the peak volume, were produced. Conditions in 1925 were very similar to what they are today. Homes were being built at prices and rents which only a small portion of American families could afford to pay. When that limited demand was filled, and when people who had overextended themselves in a desperate search for homes became unable to meet mortgage payments, home building started down the toboggan slide. The result was that average housing production during the two decades before the war was only 500,000 homes a year, just enough to keep up with the increase in families and not enough to take worn-out and other bad houses out of use and send them to the junkyard.

This example which all of us remember characterizes the history of home construction and this history will not change until one fundamental characteristic of the industry as it existed then and exists today is changed. That characteristic is that not enough people can afford new housing at the prices and rents at which it is made available to permit a sustained production sufficient to meet American needs. There are two ways of assuring enough housing for the American people—one is through a vast public housing program, the other is to bring the costs of private housing down, in relation to incomes, so that there will be enough demand to sustain the high rate of production which America needs. I think our emphasis should be on the latter. I think the Government should utilize its resources fully to help private enterprise get its costs down. I would like to see this filtration theory we hear about work, but it will work only if you pour in enough new houses to crowd out the slums at the bottom.

It is hardly germane to say that the costs of housing have not increased any than other prices, although there is good evidence that building costs, and the selling prices of both new and used houses, have exceeded the general rise in the costs of living and income. What is important is that new houses cost too much today to sustain production at the levels needed, just as they did in the thirties and the twenties.

What is needed is for the home building industry to catch up with the modern industrial parade. It needs to develop mass production methods to serve the mass markets awaiting for it. It needs to have the shackles of outmoded building codes and restrictive practices removed. The Federal Government can help in two principal ways. It can adapt its credit aids to the needs of builders using modern production methods. And it can inaugurate a program of research into new methods, materials, and techniques and to encourage their adoption. The authority would be, and should be, broad enough to permit the Government to cooperate with home building in all aspects of housing, from the improvement of production methods in the factory down to the modernization of building codes. Congress will have ample opportunity to control the extent of these activities from year to year through the appropriations procedure.

I would be amazed at the shortsighted opposition of some of the leaders of the home-building industry to this research program if the same sort of thing had not happened before. It took years of actual experience, for example, before home-financing institutions came to recognize the benefits to their own business of the FHA system of home financing. The Government undertook the mortgage insurance program of the FHA because no single segment of the home-building industry had sufficient resources to assume the risks it involved. The Government will have to assume leadership for a broad research program, because no element of the home-building industry has the resources with which to do the kind of a job that needs to be done. Those who fear the socialization of the housing industry should be the first to support this kind of a program, for the best way to avoid socialization of this or any other industry is to maintain the confidence of the people that private enterprise is serving their needs. This research program will help private enterprise serve the housing needs of the American people.

I am hopeful that with the improved credit aids to private industry and a broad program of research, private enterprise will, in time, be able to take care of the housing needs of most of the American people. But I do not believe that with these aids private enterprise will be able to assume the burdens unaided of clearing out the festering slums in our cities. The changes in methods of production and distribution which we hope to see accomplished will not be sweeping or rapid enough to permit any early solution, by private enterprise, of the problems of low-income families living in urban slums or in the bad housing in our rural areas. Any comprehensive housing program must deal with these problems, too, if it is to accomplish decent homes for all American families. So the modest programs in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill of Federal assistance for slum clearance and public housing and of direct credit and subsidies for the improvement of farm homes are essential parts of that bill. I would like to remind this House that these are modest programs, limited to 5 years, during which private enterprise may demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Congress, whether it intends or will be able to take care of the needs of lower income families.

I have heard it said that the way to clear slums is to get rid of them, but nobody has ever explained to me how private builders are going to be able to buy up slum land at its present costs, remove the old houses, and then replan and redevelop the areas with homes which people can afford to buy. Private builders will do as they always have done, and do their building on raw, inexpensive land. The essence of the urban redevelopment program contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is for the Government to share with local communities the excessive costs of acquiring and clearing slum areas so that the cleared land can be made available, primarily to private builders at prices which represent a fair value at its new use.

Neither has anybody ever explained to me how private builders are going to provide decent homes at prices and rents which present slum dwellers or other low-income families can afford to pay. The people who have talked so glibly about the fine workings of the filtration theory have recently come along with some figures which, assuming certain things happened, purported to show that private enterprise was building for low-income families. I am sure those figures are small comfort to the low-income veteran looking for a place in which to live, or to the low-income family huddled together in a decaying tenement. They certainly are not believed by 90 percent of governors, mayors, and prominent individuals, including a majority of those connected with the home-building industry, who, according to a report issued by the Joint Committee on Housing, said that private enterprise would not be able to provide decent homes for all low-income families within the foreseeable future. If, as opponents of housing legislation attempt to prove, 20 percent of the houses built last year finally were priced at $4,500 or less, they are not in localities of greatest housing need or else they are shacks which are substandard to begin with or soon will be. There are certainly no such numbers of decent homes in Washington or in my home city at that price. A recent Census survey indicates that the average prices at which new homes are being sold today in Washington is $13,000 to $15,000. This is beyond the means of four-fifths of the families in Washington.

There is only one way I know of at the present time to hope that these families will have decent homes in which to live, and that is through public assistance.

The only other argument against public assistance for slum clearance and public-housing programs that deserves serious consideration is that these are problems that the local communities can and should solve. The fact is that most cities cannot afford to take on the additional burden and that the few cities which can will be able to handle only a part of the problem. The governors and mayors who replied to the joint committee questionnaire sent out by Senator WAGNER agreed that the cities and States could not take care of all the needs of low-income families, and only a few thought they could go beyond local tax exemption for public-housing projects. Their judgment is sustained by the report, Coordination of Federal and State Taxes, filed by Senator BRICKER. This report describes the financial strains being imposed upon the cities and States by higher costs of services, by the necessity for making up for wartime postponement of replacements, maintenance work, and new construction, and by the inflexibility of their principal source of revenue, real-estate taxes. It is sustained by the heavy bond flotations of municipalities and by the increase in interest rates on such issues. It is obvious that if we leave the problem of slums and bad housing exclusively to the local communities it will not be solved. I believe that the Federal Government, together with the local communities, has a responsibility for the people's housing needs. I think it has some responsibility of seeing that children start out in life with the equality of opportunity that only decent homes can provide.

So I urge passage of a comprehensive housing bill. We need to retain and improve the financing aids to private industry which this Government has been supplying since the middle thirties. We need to institute a program of research to help private industry do a better job of supplying the Nation's housing needs. And finally we need to provide financial assistance in those areas in which private enterprise is unable to operate. Only by

a program containing all these measures will this Nation be able to work toward a solution of its entire housing problem.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 1 minute, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I impugn the motives of nobody, but if I were to vote for this bill under these conditions, I would feel that I was perpetrating a fraud upon the American people, for the simple reason that I think I know that this means there will be no housing legislation at this session of Congress. I think we should show our resentment of this procedure and this kind of a bill by voting down this motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think the issues in respect to housing have been crystallized to the point where almost everyone's position is known.

I was a little amazed that the gentleman from Texas, my exceptionally good friend, the minority leader, would make a statement which is in effect that we cannot provide shelter in America through private sources; that the Government has got to build the houses. I do not think my esteemed friend from Texas wants to put himself in the same category of those many witnesses who came before the Committee on Banking and Currency and admitted that the provisions of the bill, which was rejected by the House Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday morning, were socialistic in purpose. The very basis of socialism is that the Government shall take over when private enterprise has failed to meet a demand or a production program. I do not call anyone a Socialist in respect to this legislation. There has been so much loose talk about it, so much demagoguery about it, so much misunderstanding, and so few facts.

However, let me call attention, after making the statement that almost every one of the witnesses for the proponents of this legislation, predicated the necessity for public housing on the ground that private enterprise had failed, although private enterprise had built 835,100 units last year, and this year will build more than a million units, in face of the fact that when the Government did at one time have control over this subject in 1946, the Government, with all the power at its command to channel every inch and every ounce of building materials into the home-building field, produced only 437,800 units.

Now, has private enterprise failed? If private enterprise has not failed, then this House has no business turning this program over to the Government.

There was a very honest-minded, serious, conscientious Socialist who testified before our committee. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] asked him to define the differences, to point out the differences between the different political parties, and he did; and on page 776 of the hearings he said:

> The Socialist Party—

Have in mind this is a Socialist, the mayor of Milwaukee, Mr. Zeidler—

> The Socialist Party or the Socialists as a whole, and they are well represented all over the world, particularly by that element in the British labor movement, conceive the function of government to be democratic in its essence and feel that wherever there is a basic activity or a basic production method which is not being met or which is not being carried fully by the private-enterprise system, that there it is a responsibility of the community to step in and try to meet that need.

I do not say that this is a socialistic program; the Socialists themselves say that it is a socialistic program.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, I cannot; I am sorry.

The bill which you have before you is a bill which will provide and will assure that every ounce and every inch of available building materials and every minute of available labor will be utilized to the fullest extent in the next 12 months, making possible a program of building more units than have ever been built in a comparable period of time by any country under the canopy of God's heaven.

We should be proud of this Government of ours, and I am; and whatever I have done and whatever those of us who have sincerely since 1939 opposed socialized housing, whatever we have done has been in the interest of preserving the American system. If we have sinned in that respect we have sinned in accordance with and not in defiance of the Constitution of the United States.

A coalition of constitutionalists in this House in 1939—and the gentleman from Oklahoma was one of them then—on this floor by a good substantial majority defeated a rule for the continuance of this program. The principle of this program was before us at that time.

I wish some of your Members who are here now and who voted on that rule would turn to the record before you vote in order that you will not be in the inconsistent position of bravely and conscientiously voting against public housing then and now because you see in it some political advantage voting for socialized housing.

Let us be careful of what we do here. We are setting a precedent, perhaps, we are setting a precedent.

If private enterprise has failed to produce enough houses to justify the Government's taking over, then does the same philosophy apply to the failure of private enterprise to produce enough automobiles, enough shoes, at reasonable prices, enough food at reasonable prices? You have identically the same thing involved.

Is the next step to ask the automobile industry to move aside and let the Government get into the production of trucks and automobiles? Are you going to Brockton and other towns in the New England States and say that because shoes cannot be bought in the United States for less than $10 that the Government must step in and manufacture your shoes? Are we going out on the farms and say to the farmers: "Because you cannot produce enough food at low enough cost, the Government must come in and operate your farms?" In the rural provisions of this bill which we refused to report out of the committee, there was the socialistic provision that the Government should step on to each and every farm which asked for relief under that bill and virtually operate the farm by setting up the standards under which that farm should be operated, the crops that should be put in and so forth.

That, Mr. Speaker, is socialism. I do not care who it is that goes along with it, he has got to answer to the people. He has got to reconcile the position which he takes on this bill with the definition of socialism. I have tried to do so. Now, if there is any doubt at all, let us resolve the doubt in favor of the American form of Government which has resulted in a production effort during the war and since the war which is the envy of every socialistic country in the world.

This bill will make it possible to build houses to meet the emergency. If you had adopted the provision we struck out of the bill on public housing, you would have superimposed a public housing program, a Government project, on top of the present demand, amounting to something like $6,000,000,000 which, of course, would have resulted in further inflationary tendencies, making the cost of houses so high that nobody could possibly afford to buy any houses whatsoever. It was inflationary. Government housing is inflationary. One of the sponsors in the other body said that to permit the spending of $7,000,000,000 at the present time is the most inflationary thing that we could do.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I know the provisions in the bill before us and I think they will do much to help the housing problem. I wonder if the gentleman would not sketch through what those are, very briefly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. You are all familiar with title VI. I am glad the gentlemen who are seemingly opposed to this bill have found so many good things in it that should be enacted into law. The continuance of title VI is one of them. Title VI makes possible the organization of veterans' cooperatives and they may have the financing of the cooperative ventures insured up to 95 percent. We make possible the building of thousands of multiple-dwelling units and apartment houses in cities through accelerated depreciation.

You will understand that we are not robbing the Treasury of anything in that particular provision of the bill because if the houses are not built, then, of course, the Treasury will get no revenue whatsoever incident to the production of the houses. All taxes stem from production. If the houses are built the Government's

revenue will ultimately increase. Without this provision we may expect very little risk capital to venture into the field of multiple-apartment buildings. At today's high prices few builders will take a chance on realizing on their investment. The alternative is Government subsidies which in the end would be very costly to the American taxpayers. With the provision, revenues to the Government will materially increase and we will get the production of much-needed housing in the big-city areas.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the House should pass this bill and houses will be built under it. We want to adjourn tomorrow night and I may say with reasonable certainty that this is probably the only housing bill which we can get through.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Gladly.

Mr. KEOGH. Section 603 (b) of the pending bill amends section 608 (b) (3) (C) of the National Housing Act to permit the Administrator to increase to $9,100 per family unit the amount of the mortgage when, in his discretion, cost levels so require. Will the gentleman express his opinion as to whether this amendment will permit the Administrator to hold that the construction of a family unit in excess of 4½ rooms, for example, to 5½ rooms, will so affect the cost level as to justify increasing the amount of the mortgage to $9,100 per family unit of 5½ rooms in any approved project?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can assure the gentleman that the Administrator may increase the insurance to $9,100 per unit regardless of the number of rooms. We have removed the limit per room and put the limit on a unit basis. In directly answering the gentleman's question, I believe I can give him better than reasonable assurances that, under the example cited, the Administrator would not only be justified in using this discretionary authority but it is our intent that he do so, especially in the case of veterans' rental projects.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 319, nays 90, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—319

Abernethy	Bender	Byrnes, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Camp
Allen, Ill.	Bennett, Mo.	Canfield
Allen, La.	Bishop	Cannon
Andersen, H. Carl	Blackney	Carson
Anderson, Calif.	Bland	Case, N. J.
Andresen, August H.	Boggs, Del.	Case, S. Dak.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bolton	Chadwick
Angell	Boykin	Chenoweth
Arends	Bradley	Chiperfield
Arnold	Bramblett	Church
Auchincloss	Brehm	Clark
Bakewell	Brooks	Clason
Banta	Brophy	Clevenger
Barden	Brown, Ga.	Coffin
Barrett	Bryson	Cole, Kans.
Bates, Mass.	Buck	Cole, Mo.
Beall	Bulwinkle	Cole, N. Y.
Bell	Burke	Colmer
	Busbey	Cooley
	Butler	Cooper
Corbett	Hull	Phillips, Calif.
Cotton	Jackson, Calif.	Phillips, Tenn.
Coudert	Jenison	Pickett
Courtney	Jenkins, Ohio	Ploeser
Cox	Jenkins, Pa.	Plumley
Cravens	Jennings	Potter
Crawford	Jensen	Potts
Crosser	Johnson, Calif.	Poulson
Crow	Johnson, Ill.	Preston
Cunningham	Johnson, Ind.	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Jones, N. C.	Priest
Dague	Jones, Wash.	Ramey
Davis, Ga.	Jonkman	Rankin
Davis, Wis.	Judd	Redden
Dawson, Utah	Kean	Reed, Ill.
Devitt	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Kearns	Rees
Dirksen	Keating	Reeves
Dolliver	Kee	Rich
Domengeaux	Keefe	Richards
Dondero	Kefauver	Riehlman
Dorn	Kerr	Riley
Doughton	Kersten, Wis.	Rizley
Durham	Kilburn	Rockwell
Eaton	Kilday	Rogers, Fla.
Elliott	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Ellis	Landis	Rohrbough
Ellsworth	Lanham	Ross
Elsaesser	Larcade	Russell
Elston	Latham	Sadlak
Engel, Mich.	Lea	St. George
Evins	LeCompte	Sanborn
Fallon	LeFevre	Sarbacher
Fellows	Lemke	Sasscer
Fenton	Lewis, Ky.	Schwabe, Okla.
Fernandez	Lewis, Ohio	Scoblick
Fisher	Lichtenwalter	Scott, Hardie
Fletcher	Lodge	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Folger	Love	Scrivner
Foote	Lucas	Seely-Brown
Fuller	Lyle	Shafer
Fulton	McConnell	Sheppard
Gallagher	McCowen	Short
Gamble	McCulloch	Sikes
Garmatz	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Gathings	McDowell	Smith, Kans.
Gavin	McGarvey	Smith, Maine
Gearhart	McGregor	Smith, Va.
Gillette	McMahon	Smith, Wis.
Gillie	McMillan, S. C.	Snyder
Goff	McMillen, Ill.	Somers
Goodwin	Mack	Stefan
Gossett	MacKinnon	Stevenson
Graham	Macy	Stockman
Granger	Mahon	Stratton
Grant, Ind.	Maloney	Sundstrom
Griffiths	Manasco	Taber
Gross	Mason	Talle
Gwinn, N. Y.	Mathews	Taylor
Gwynne, Iowa	Meade, Ky.	Thomas, Tex.
Hagen	Meade, Md.	Tibbott
Hale	Merrow	Tollefson
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meyer	Towe
Hall, Leonard W.	Michener	Twyman
Halleck	Miller, Conn.	Vail
Hand	Miller, Md.	Van Zandt
Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Nebr.	Vinson
Harness, Ind.	Mills	Vorys
Harris	Mitchell	Vursell
Harrison	Morrison	Wadsworth
Harvey	Morton	Weichel
Hébert	Muhlenberg	Welch
Hedrick	Mundt	Wheeler
Heffernan	Murdock	Whitten
Hendricks	Murray, Tenn.	Whittington
Herter	Murray, Wis.	Wigglesworth
Heselton	Nicholson	Williams
Hess	Nixon	Wilson, Ind.
Hill	Nodar	Wilson, Tex.
Hinshaw	Norblad	Winstead
Hoeven	Norrell	Wolcott
Hoffman	O'Hara	Wolverton
Holmes	O'Konski	Wood
Hope	Pace	Woodruff
Horan	Passman	Worley
	Patterson	Youngblood
	Peterson	

NAYS—90

Abbitt	Chapman	Gordon
Albert	Chelf	Gore
Andrews, Ala.	Combs	Gorski
Bates, Ky.	Dawson, Ill.	Grant, Ala.
Battle	Deane	Gregory
Beckworth	Delaney	Hardy
Blatnik	Dingell	Hart
Bloom	Donohue	Havenner
Boggs, La.	Douglas	Hays
Buchanan	Eberharter	Hobbs
Buckley	Engle, Calif.	Holifield
Buffett	Feighan	Huber
Burleson	Flannagan	Isacson
Byrne, N. Y.	Fogarty	Jackson, Wash.
Carroll	Forand	Jarman
Celler	Gary	Jones, Ala.
Karsten, Mo.	Miller, Calif.	Rayburn
Kelley	Monroney	Rooney
Kennedy	Morgan	Sabath
Keogh	Multer	Sadowski
King	Norton	Schwabe, Mo.
Kirwan	O'Brien	Smathers
Klein	O'Toole	Smith, Ohio
Lesinski	Patman	Spence
Lusk	Pfeifer	Stanley
Lynch	Philbin	Teague
McCormack	Poage	Thompson
Madden	Powell	Trimble
Mansfield	Price, Ill.	Walter
Marcantonio	Rains	Whitaker

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Javits

NOT VOTING—20

Bonner	Knutson	Rivers
Brown, Ohio	Lane	Robertson
Clippinger	Ludlow	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Martin, Iowa	Stigler
Hartley	Morris	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Okla.	Peden	West
Johnson, Tex.	Regan	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Ludlow.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Knutson with Mr. Regan.

Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Morris.

Mr. WOLVERTON and Mr. KERR changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. ENGLE of California changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

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. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE HAROLD KNUTSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution offered by me and unanimously adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was offered by the Honorable ROBERT DOUGHTON on June 17, 1948, and was unanimously approved by the Committee on Ways and Means:

RESOLUTION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas the Committee on Ways and Means during the first and second sessions of

the Eightieth Congress has made definite progress in the enormous task of converting the wartime Federal tax structure to a simplified, equitable, and permanent peacetime basis; and,

Whereas extensive hearings and studies on tax revision have been carried on simultaneously with fulfillment of the other responsibilities of the committee in the fields of social security, tariff, and reciprocal trade, customs, and the public debt; and

Whereas the effective coordination of the work of the committee and its subcommittees has been attributable largely to the diligence, persistence, and guidance of our able, courageous, and distinguished chairman, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota; and

Whereas the aforesaid chairman has consistently conducted the deliberations of the Committee on Ways and Means as to provide an amiable atmosphere for the prompt consideration and expeditious disposition of committee business, thereby earning the highest esteem and regard of the members of the committee, regardless of party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means, United States House of Representatives, hereby express our appreciation for the forceful, courageous, tireless, and able statesmanship and service of Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means during the Eightieth Congress, and that an engraved copy of this resolution be presented to the chairman as a tangible token of our gratitude.

TRIBUTE TO HON. HAROLD KNUTSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each member of the Ways and Means Committee may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD in reference to Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

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, the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives met on June 18, 1948, in the Capitol to pay a well-deserved tribute to the present Chairman HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota. A resolution was introduced by Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, accompanied by appropriate words of praise for the excellent record made by his colleague. The resolution was unanimously and enthusiastically adopted by the committee.

I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation for the many courtesies and kindnesses received at the hands of my chairman. He has now entered the Ways and Means Hall of Fame of the illustrious men who have attained to the chairmanship of this powerful committee of the greatest legislative body in the world, the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

I am inserting at this point a brief historical sketch of the House Ways and Means Committee and the distinguished members thereof who later in life filled other important Federal positions. In some instances the State in which a member was born appears rather than from the State from which he was elected:

BRIEF HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Article I, section VII, of the United States Constitution provides: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

The House of Representatives since the beginning has adopted the system of committees to carry out its public affairs program. In fact, there are a few committees which are as old as the House itself. Historically, some even antedate the United States Constitution.

In May 1785 the Continental Congress had a committee, of which George Washington was chairman, "to consider ways and means to supply these Colonies with ammunition and military stores." This committee of "ways and means" functioned as a select committee up until 1802. As early as 1796, Mr. Gallatin moved that a standing committee on Ways and Means be appointed to watch over the national finances. But it was not until January 7, 1802, that the committee became an organization of the type which we now know.

Originally the Ways and Means Committee considered not only the methods of raising the revenues of the Nation, but the committee also made whatever appropriations were necessary to make the money available for public expenditure. In 1865 the business of initiating appropriations was transferred to the Committee on Appropriations and certain other classes of bills which originally had been considered by the Ways and Means Committee were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The jurisdiction which the Ways and Means Committee now has is extended (outside the consideration of duties on imports and the raising of internal revenue taxes) to such related subjects as: transportation of dutiable goods; the organization and definition of collection districts; ports of entry and delivery; customs unions; reciprocity treaties; seal herds and other revenue producing animals of Alaska; the revenue relations of the United States with Puerto Rico; the revenue bills relating to agricultural products generally; and the tax on future sales of cotton and grain; social security and other activities.

In addition, the committee has jurisdiction over bills relating to the Treasury of the United States and the deposit of public moneys. It also reports the resolutions giving recommendations of Presidents' annual messages to the appropriate committees of the House.

The following list shows former members of the Ways and Means Committee who have risen to the office of President, Vice President, became members of the Cabinet, served as Justices of the Supreme Court, or were elevated to the Speakership of the House of Representatives:

PRESIDENTS

James Madison, Virginia; Andrew Jackson, Tennessee; James K. Polk, Tennessee; Millard Fillmore, New York; James A. Garfield, Ohio; William McKinley, Ohio.

VICE PRESIDENTS

Elbridge Gerry, Massachusetts; Richard M. Johnson, Kentucky; John Tyler, Virginia; Millard Fillmore, New York; John C. Breckenridge, Kentucky; Charles Curtis, Kansas; John N. Garner, Texas.

SECRETARIES OF STATE

James Madison, Virginia; Louis McLane, Delaware; John Sherman, Ohio; William J. Bryan, Nebraska; Cordell Hull, Tennessee.

SECRETARIES OF THE TREASURY

Albert Gallatin, Pennsylvania; George W. Campbell, Tennessee; Samuel D. Ingham, Pennsylvania; Louis McLane, Delaware; Thomas Corwin, Ohio; Howell Cobb, Georgia; John Sherman, Ohio; Charles Foster, Ohio; John G. Carlisle, Kentucky; Ogden L. Mills, New York; Fred M. Vinson, Kentucky.

ATTORNEYS GENERAL

John Breckenridge, Kentucky; Caesar A. Rodney, Delaware; Joseph McKenna, California; A. Mitchell Palmer, Pennsylvania.

POSTMASTERS GENERAL

Cave Johnson, Tennessee; Samuel D. Hubbard, Connecticut; James Campbell, Pennsylvania; Horace Maynard, Tennessee; William L. Wilson, West Virginia.

SECRETARIES OF THE NAVY

Thomas W. Gilmer, Virginia; Hilary A. Herbert, Alabama; Victor H. Metcalf, California; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Jacob Thompson, Mississippi.

JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT

Philip P. Barbour, Virginia; John McKinley, Alabama; Joseph McKenna, California; Fred M. Vinson, Kentucky.

SPEAKERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Theodore Sedgwick, Massachusetts; Langdon Cheves, South Carolina; John W. Taylor, New York; Philip B. Barbour, Virginia; Andrew Stevenson, Virginia; James K. Polk, Tennessee, John W. Jones, Virginia; Robert C. Winthrop, Massachusetts; Howell Cobb, Georgia; Nathaniel P. Banks, Massachusetts; Michael C. Kerr, Indiana; Samuel J. Randall, Pennsylvania; John G. Carlisle, Kentucky; Thomas B. Reed, Maine; Charles F. Crisp, Georgia; Champ Clark, Missouri; Nicholas Longworth, Ohio; John N. Garner, Texas; Henry T. Rainey, Illinois.

(Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

CHAIRMAN, WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

First Congress: Thomas Fitzsimmons, Pennsylvania.

Second Congress: Thomas Fitzsimmons, Pennsylvania.

Third Congress: Thomas Fitzsimmons, Pennsylvania.

Fourth Congress: William Smith, South Carolina.

Fifth Congress: R. G. Harper, South Carolina.

Sixth Congress: Roger Griswold, Connecticut.

Seventh Congress: John Randolph, Virginia.

Eighth Congress: John Randolph, Virginia.

Ninth Congress: Joseph Clay, Pennsylvania.

Tenth Congress: George W. Campbell, Tennessee.

Eleventh Congress: John W. Eppes, Virginia.

Twelfth Congress: Langdon Cheves, South Carolina.

Thirteenth Congress: John W. Eppes, Virginia.

Fourteenth Congress: William Lowndes, South Carolina.

Fifteenth Congress: William Lowndes, South Carolina.

Sixteenth Congress: Samuel Smith, Maryland.

Seventeenth Congress: Samuel Smith, Maryland.

Eighteenth Congress: Louis McLane, Delaware.

Nineteenth Congress: Louis McLane, Delaware.

Twentieth Congress: George McDuffie, South Carolina.

Twenty-first Congress: George McDuffie, South Carolina.

Twenty-second Congress: Gullion C. Verplanck, New York.

Twenty-third Congress: James K. Polk, Tennessee.

Twenty-fourth Congress: Churchill C. Chambreleng, New York.
Twenty-fifth Congress: Churchill C. Chambreleng, New York.
Twenty-sixth Congress: John W. Jones, Virginia.
Twenty-seventh Congress: Millard Fillmore, New York.
Twenty-eighth Congress: James J. McKay, North Carolina.
Twenty-ninth Congress: James J. McKay, North Carolina.
Thirtieth Congress: S. F. Vinton, Ohio.
Thirty-first Congress: James H. Bayley, Virginia.
Thirty-second Congress: George S. Houston, Alabama.
Thirty-third Congress: George S. Houston, Alabama.
Thirty-fourth Congress: Lewis D. Campbell, Ohio.
Thirty-fifth Congress: John S. Phelps, Missouri—J. Glancy Jones, Pennsylvania.
Thirty-sixth Congress: John Sherman, Ohio.
Thirty-seventh Congress: Thaddeus Stevens, Pennsylvania.
Thirty-eighth Congress: Thaddeus Stevens, Pennsylvania.
Thirty-ninth Congress: Justin S. Morrill, Vermont.
Fortieth Congress: Robert C. Schenk, Ohio.
Forty-first Congress: Robert C. Schenk, Ohio.
Forty-second Congress: Henry Dawes, Massachusetts
Forty-third Congress: Henry Dawes, Massachusetts.
Forty-fourth Congress: William R. Morrison, Illinois.
Forty-fifth Congress: Fernando Wood, New York.
Forty-sixth Congress: Fernando Wood, New York.
Forty-seventh Congress: William D. Kelley, Pennsylvania.
Forty-eighth Congress: William R. Morrison, Illinois.
Forty-ninth Congress: William R. Morrison, Illinois.
Fiftieth Congress: Roger Q. Mills, Texas.
Fifty-first Congress: William McKinley, Ohio.
Fifty-second Congress: William M. Springer, Illinois.
Fifty-third Congress: William L. Wilson, West Virginia.
Fifty-fourth Congress: Nelson Dingley, Maine.
Fifty-fifth Congress: Nelson Dingley, Maine.
Fifty-sixth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Fifty-seventh Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Fifty-eighth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Fifty-ninth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Sixtieth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Sixty-first Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Sixty-second Congress: Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama.
Sixty-third Congress: Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama.
Sixty-fourth Congress: Claude W. Kitchin, North Carolina.
Sixty-fifth Congress: Claude W. Kitchin, North Carolina.
Sixty-sixth Congress: Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan.
Sixty-seventh Congress: Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan.
Sixty-eighth Congress: William R. Green, Iowa.
Sixty-ninth Congress: William R. Green, Iowa.
Seventieth Congress: William C. Hawley, Oregon.
Seventy-first Congress: William C. Hawley, Oregon.
Seventy-second Congress: James W. Collier, Mississippi.
Seventy-third Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-fourth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-fifth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-sixth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-seventh Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-eighth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-ninth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Eightieth Congress: HAROLD KNUTSON, Minnesota.

Chairmanship of Ways and Means Committee by States and sections

	Congresses
North and Middle West:	
Maine	2
Vermont	1
Massachusetts	2
Connecticut	1
New York	12
Pennsylvania	8
Delaware	2
Ohio	6
Illinois	4
Michigan	2
Minnesota	1
Iowa	2
	43
South and Southwest:	
Maryland	2
Virginia	6
West Virginia	1
North Carolina	11
South Carolina	7
Tennessee	2
Alabama	4
Mississippi	1
Missouri	1
Texas	1
	36
Far West: Oregon	2
Total	[1] 81

[1] During the 35th Cong. J. Glancy Jones (Pennsylvania) was chairman first session; John S. Phelps (Missouri) second session.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN FROM NEW YORK

G. Crommelin Verplanck

Mr. Verplanck was a New Yorker, the son of a clergyman, a graduate of Columbia in law, a man of much travel and a professor of the Evidences of Christianity in the General Theological Seminary before he took to politics. He was a Democrat of the school of Andrew Jackson and made his first appearance in Congress in the term which began in 1823. After that, was out of the House until 1831, when he was returned to the Twenty-second Congress, in which he was chairman of Ways and Means. This term was his last appearance in Congress, but not in politics. He was defeated for mayor of New York in 1834, but seems to have spent most of the remainder of his life in one or another compensated public pursuit, dying as vice chancellor of the University of the State of New York, of which he had been a regent for 45 years.

Churchill C. Cambreleng

Mr. Cambreleng was chairman of Ways and Means in the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Congresses. He was born in Washington, Beaufort County, N. C., October 24, 1786; attended school in New Bern, N. C.; moved to New York City in 1802, where he became a clerk and subsequently engaged in the mercantile business; elected as a Democrat to the Seventeenth and to the eight succeeding Congresses; unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1838 to the Twenty-sixth Congress; appointed United States Minister to Russia by President Van Buren, and served from May 20, 1840, to July 13, 1841; member of the State constitutional convention, 1846; retired from active business pursuits; died at his residence near Huntington, Suffolk County, N. Y., April 30, 1862; interment in Greenwood Cemetery, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Millard Fillmore

Mr. Fillmore was chairman in the Twenty-seventh Congress. He was born in Locke Township (now Summerhill), Cayuga County, N. Y., January 7, 1800; was admitted to the bar in 1823; member of the State assembly, 1829–1831; elected as a Whig to the Twenty-third Congress; elected to the Twenty-fifth, Twenty-sixth, and Twenty-seventh Congresses; declined to be a candidate for renomination in 1842; unsuccessful Whig candidate for Governor in 1844; elected State comptroller in 1847, and served until his resignation in 1849; elected Vice President of the United States on the Whig ticket headed by Zachary Taylor in 1848; became President upon the death of President Taylor, and served from July 9, 1850, to March 3, 1853; unsuccessful Whig candidate for President in 1852 and as the National American candidate in 1856; died in Buffalo, N. Y., March 8, 1874; interment in Forest Hill Cemetery.

Fernando Wood

Fernando Wood was chairman in the Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Congresses. He was born in Philadelphia, Pa., June 14, 1812; moved with his father to New York City in 1820, was engaged in business as a shipping merchant in 1831, was elected as Tammany Democrat to the Twenty-seventh Congress, unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1842 to the Twenty-eighth Congress, appointed by Secretary of State John C. Calhoun dispatch agent for the State Department at the port of New York, reappointed by Secretary of State James Buchanan and served from 1844 to 1847; unsuccessful candidate for mayor of New York City in 1850; mayor of New York City in 1855–58, 1861, and 1862; elected Democrat to the Thirty-eighth Congress; unsuccessful candidate for reelection to the Thirty-ninth Congress; elected to the Fortieth, and each succeeding Congress, including the Forty-seventh, until his death at Hot Springs, Ark., February 13, 1881, before the beginning of the Forty-seventh Congress; interment in Trinity Cemetery, New York City.

Sereno E. Payne

Sereno Payne was chairman from the Fifty-sixth to Sixty-first Congresses, inclusive. He was born in Hamilton, Madison County, N. Y., June 26, 1843; attended the Auburn Academy and was graduated from the University of Rochester, N. Y., in 1864; studied law, was admitted to the bar in 1866, and practiced in Auburn, N. Y.; city clerk of Auburn in 1867 and 1868; supervisor in 1871 and 1872; district attorney of Cayuga County, 1873–79; president of the Board of Education of Auburn, 1879–82; appointed a member of the American-British Joint High Commisison in January 1899; elected as Republican to the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses; elected to the Fifty-first Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Newton W. Nutting; reelected to the Fifty-second and to the 11 succeeding Congresses, and served from March 4, 1889, until his death; had been reelected to the Sixty-fourth Congress; died in Washington, D. C., December 10, 1914; interment in Fort Hill Cemetery, Auburn, N. Y.

(Source: Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774–1927.)

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution of commendation of the distin-

guished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, my good friend, HAROLD KNUTSON, is a sincere expression of the esteem in which he is held by all the members of our committee. I appreciate this opportunity to speak from the heart the personal satisfaction that I have enjoyed in serving with the gentleman from Minnesota on the Committee on Ways and Means. When I came to Congress Mr. KNUTSON had already served more than a score of years. He was then a militant leader of the minority, but he has ever been willing to make available to me his kindly and experienced counsel.

When I became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1942, this friendship became firmly cemented in the bonds of day to day association in the disposition of common problems.

Notwithstanding his heavy load of increased respnsibilities during the Eightieth Congress as chairman of the committee, I have felt free to consult and confer with him on any matter pending before the committee—whether on taxes, reciprocal trade, or social security. It is because of this close friendship and constant association that I am so much aware of the diligent, devoted statesmanship and public service of Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON in the interests of the taxpayers of the Nation. I trust that we may share many more happy and fruitful years together on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with those who are paying respect to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

The resolution which was on yesterday passed by the Ways and Means Committee was presented to that committee by the distinguished former chairman, Mr. DOUGHTON. As we all know, he is one of the most highly respected Democrats in this House and is the oldest Member of this House and has the second longest record of service of any Member in the House. Mr. DOUGHTON'S action is significant in view of the further fact that Mr. KNUTSON is the oldest Republican Member in the House from the standpoint of service. Mr. DOUGHTON is serving his nineteenth term and Mr. KNUTSON is serving his sixteenth term. Mr. DOUGHTON served longer as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee than any man in the history of that great committee.

Mr. KNUTSON has been a member of the Ways and Means Committee for a great number of years and his service has been conspicuous. As chairman of the committee he has been very successful in leading this great committee in the preparation and passage of many measures of great importance to the Nation. The Knutson bill which passed in the present session of Congress will go down in the legislative history of Congress as a very important enactment. The bill was well drawn and met with the approval of the Members of Congress and of the country. This is proved by the fact that this bill was passed by the House in spite of the veto of the President. Mr. KNUTSON has shown great organizational ability in the manner in which he has conducted the business of the Ways and Means Committee. He has the respect of all those who serve with him. I concur most heartily in all the sentiments expressed in the resolution.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress draws to a close, the members of the Ways and Means Committee have recognized in a small way the fine service of our chairman the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON.

Yesterday, the committee adopted a resolution of congratulation and commendation of our distinguished colleague, and I take this opportunity to say that I subscribe 100 percent to the expressions contained in the resolution and extend to our chairman my best wishes for good health, a well-deserved vacation, and a return to this great body if it is his wish.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, in order to render the best service to our country while serving as chairman of a committee in the House of Representatives, it is not sufficient to be a patriotic legislator who has the best interest of all the people in mind and who can weigh fairly the pros and cons of bills which may come before him, but it is also necessary to have the executive ability to delegate those duties that can be delegated to other members of the committee—to encourage them to cooperate and to engender in the committee that spirit of fellowship and teamwork which will result in legislation being reported with as much unanimity as is possible among any group with divergent political views. To find such a man is rare.

The record of accomplishment of the Ways and Means Committee during the Eightieth Congress is proof that in its chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, we have a leader with these qualities.

During this past session the committee has been faced with the highly technical matters of tax reduction, tax revision, social security, reciprocal trade, and much other legislation of vital importance to the country. The fact that all bills reported out of the committee which have been voted on by the House have passed by overwhelming majorities is proof of the efficient work of the committee under his able leadership.

May our chairman give many more years of fine service to his country and his district in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to felicitate the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, upon the wonderful record he has made in his thirty-odd years as a Member of the House of Representatives; and especially to thank him for his leadership as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee during the busy and difficult days of the Eightieth Congress.

The work of this great committee during the time this country has been adjusting from a war economy to a reconstruction and peacetime program has been difficult and tedious.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has presided over our work with poise, dignity, and ability. His experience and farsighted statesmanship has guided and sustained us.

As a member of the committee of a different political faith, I appreciate his fairness, his kindness, and his desire at all times to serve his country first.

This veteran legislator and leader is loved and respected by us all.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure, indeed, to join with my colleagues of the Committee on Ways and Means in extending recognition and highly deserved praise of our colleague and good friend, the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, for his outstanding service as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the Eightieth Congress.

This is my first term as a member of the committee and I have been tremendously impressed by the sincere devotion to duty of the members of the committee and the good fellowship that prevails on the committee.

The good fellowship of this committee is exemplified by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, chairman for so many years prior to the Eightieth Congress, whose interest and leadership in the drafting and adoption of the resolution by the Committee on Ways and Means commending the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] speaks for itself.

I am delighted and honored to have this privilege of joining in the recognition and commendation my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] so richly deserves.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to add my voice in commendation of the service performed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It has been a great honor to have had the opportunity to serve on this great committee. It has also been an honor to serve under its distinguished chairman. He has conducted its affairs in a most honorable and fair manner. His direction of the committee has been courageous and statesmanlike. My service with him will always be one of my fondest memories.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in the splendid resolution unanimously adopted by the committee honoring our chairman, Mr. HAROLD KNUTSON, It is fine recognition of the services rendered by the chairman in handling the legislation and the work of the committee in such an efficient and fair manner.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee submits for the RECORD its written testimonial to its distinguished chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota. It is a testimonial to the man and to his work—to the outstanding service he has rendered as head of that important committee during the reconstruction days of the Eightieth Congress.

It is an honor and a privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and also to join in this tribute to one of America's outstanding sons.

HAROLD KNUTSON came to these shores as a very young man. The story of his life, of his years of experience in the school of hard knocks is a story that is typically American. HAROLD KNUTSON is a living example of the opportunities that awaited a poor immigrant boy who had the determination, the ambition, and the perseverance to forge ahead in the land of equal opportunity for all.

During his long years of service in the House of Representatives he has represented his people and the people of America faithfully and well. He has served them in many and varied capacities. He has previously served as chairman of two other committees of the House of Representatives. All of that service today is climaxed by his chairmanship of the Committee on Ways and Means. As our beloved friend and fellow Member from New York, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, has pointed out, the chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee has provided outstanding Americans for service in almost every capacity in the administrative branch of our Government, including six Presidents of these United States. That chairmanship was never in abler hands than it is in the person of Mr. KNUTSON.

It is so fitting and so representative of the unanimity and the nonpartisanship with which problems are approached by that committee that the resolution expressing the tribute of the members of the committee should have been brought forward by the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, the ranking minority member, who himself served so illustriously as chairman of this committee for many, many years.

Twenty-four members of the Committee on Ways and Means serving under our beloved chairman, Mr. KNUTSON, are as one man in wishing for him a long and happy life, and in wishing for the people of America many, many more years of his valiant and illustrious service in the Congress of the United States.

CHAIRMAN HAROLD KNUTSON IS A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a resolution has been presented which reflects the sentiments of every member of the House Committee on Ways and Means. May I say that I believe that our beloved chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, merits every tribute expressed therein.

The story of the life of HAROLD KNUTSON is typical of the American way. He came to this country as a boy from Norway. By hard work, determination, thrift, endurance, and perseverance he made a success in business. In addition, he has served his country in the Halls of Congress for all these many years. It is fitting that he should occupy one of the most powerful positions in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON espouses a philosophy that brings hope to every young American. He believes in a government that permits an individual to prepare himself, work, earn, save, and achieve. This philosophy is the hope for the young man who makes his own way. It is the ladder by which he can climb to success. It is the American way. Our beloved chairman is one of the foremost champions of that way.

TRIBUTE TO HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion a Member of Congress must be judged by the ability, the courage, and the resourcefulness with which he represents the people of his district, his State, and his Nation, Although I have differed frequently with my friend, the eminent chairman, and often we have engaged in sharp debate, I can sincerely say that I have never felt, nor have I detected in him, any lingering rancor or resentment.

Our personal relationship has ever been cordial, and in the deliberations of the committee no member has received more fair, courteous, nonpartisan consideration than I.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy for a leader to be ever gracious and kind to those who always agree with him. But it takes a rare quality of statesmanship to be equally considerate of those in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman KNUTSON has demonstrated these qualities, and I want him and the membership of this House to know that I shall ever admire, respect, and thank him for them.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives yesterday passed a resolution praising the chairman of the committee, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, for the manner in which he presided over our deliberations.

I wish to add my own word of appreciation. As a member of the Democratic minority, I can honestly say that he has upheld the high traditions of the Committee on Ways and Means and has, like his distinguished predecessor, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, presided most fairly and impartially over our many and long sessions. Although a strong partisan Republican, he never in the years of his chairmanship, has permitted his partisanship to blunt his sense of fairness. He has given us, on the minority, a fair deal and a square deal.

The characteristic of Chairman KNUTSON that, in my opinion, is most outstanding is his unfailing sense of humor, no matter how rough the going may be at the time. Many times during heated discussions on some proposed legislation, when the tempers of other members of the committee were on edge, our distinguished chairman and our distinguished former chairman have engaged in humorous colloquy that relieved the tension and brought a new approach to the subject under discussion. I have no doubt that HAROLD KNUTSON'S sense of humor has successfully carried him through many seemingly imponderable difficulties.

I wish him many years of health and happiness.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in paying tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON. Their tributes have been accurate and generous. I concur in what they have said.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving in this House with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] for 28 of my 30 years of service here. No Member is more familiar with his character, his ability, or his motives in approaching the problems which daily face us. Those who know him best agree that before taking a stand on any question, he first determines whether or not the measure is for the best interests of the people generally throughout the Nation. If he believes it is, he supports it. If he believes it is not, he vigorously opposes it.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is endowed with high intelligence and a degree of patriotism not excelled by any individual. His service has been honorable, and it has been distinguished by an intense desire to represent his constituents in a way every constituency should be represented in this body. I congratulate the people who send him here and trust they will show their appreciation of his fine service by returning him to this House so long as he desires to serve.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, since I have had the honor of serving on the Committee on Ways and Means, it has been my pleasure to serve under two distinguished chairmen—our present chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, and the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina.

I am glad to join with the other members of the Ways and Means Committee in congratulating Mr. KNUTSON upon the outstanding record he has made in his long period of service to his country as a Member of the House of Representatives. His accomplishments and record as a first-generation American should be a beacon light to all American citizens. Particularly do I wish to felicitate him upon his leadership as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. As a member of the committee of a different political faith, I appreciate the difficulties of his task, his fairness, his wisdom, and his desire at all times to serve his country first.

I am delighted and honored to have this privilege of joining in this recognition of Mr. KNUTSON.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in making a statement at this time is to place in the RECORD my hearty approval of the resolution offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, commending the services of our chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, which has received the unanimous approval of the Ways and Means Committee.

As a new member of the committee, it has been a most interesting experience to serve on this great committee, during the Eightieth Congress, under the leadership of Chairman KNUTSON.

Members who have served on the committee for a great number of years inform me that not in their memory has the committee accomplished so much in a single session in the way of major legislation. The tax-reduction bill heads the list of numerous bills in the public interest voted out of the committee. This in a very large measure is due to the courageous and able leadership of the chairman. I have found the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] to be eminently fair in his consideration of

all questions. He is a stout-hearted fighter for the right; an able statesman and a great public servant. He is the type that built this Republic and is the type that will sustain it.

I wish for my friend and colleague, Chairman KNUTSON, many more years of health, happiness, and service to his country.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, among the many treasured memories of legislative associations, there is none I shall cherish longer than that of serving in the Eightieth Congress under the inspiring leadership of Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The duties of the chairman of this important committee are most arduous. The legislative subjects of taxation, tax revision, tax reduction, the tariff, reciprocal trade and social security are all highly technical and the handling of these and other matters just as involved, through the process of committee hearings, executive committee consideration, report, clearance for House consideration and conduct of debate call for the highest qualities of generalship. HAROLD KNUTSON has demonstrated his possession of these qualities in a high degree.

His distinguished service to the country marks him as a statesman worthy to follow in the footsteps of the illustrious and distinguished gentlemen who have preceded him as chairman of this great committee not the least of whom is his immediate predecessor, the beloved gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON.

I am honored to have the privilege of joining with my committee colleagues in wishing for him a full measure of health, happiness, and success for the future and a triumphant return to further distinguished service in Congress.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly privileged as a member of the Ways and Means Committee to join my colleagues in paying this merited tribute to our distinguished chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON.

Any member of that committee, charged with the duty of preparing tax legislation, must recognize in the chairman one who from a maze of conflicting testimony is able to reach a correct conclusion. Once having reached the conclusion he believes right, HAROLD KNUTSON adheres to it unflinchingly until the final decision.

Early in the Eightieth Congress, our chairman, convinced as he was of the need for income-tax reduction, and believing firmly that the good of his country required it, introduced legislation to accomplish his purpose. Despite the utmost opposition which included two Presidential vetoes, HAROLD KNUTSON, never deviating an iota in principle, led his colleagues in Congress to final passage of his legislation.

His wisdom and courage are already proved—by his courage, perseverance and hard work, he thus raised his own monument in the minds and hearts of all American citizens.

Born in another land, our chairman has proved himself an honored and capable leader of his Nation's destiny. He has the courage and ability to meet the challenge of his times and as chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, has become a guiding light in the government of the greatest Nation in the world.

In all ways fair and impartial as chairman of the committee, HAROLD KNUTSON has endeared himself to both the majority and minority members of that committee, by recognizing the importance and vital part played by the minority in a truly representative Government, while adhering to his belief that the majority party should assume its responsibility. By his fairness he has strengthened representative government as exemplified in our committee. It is this quality which has made him a great leader and brought about the teamwork so essential for efficient committee action where constructive work is required by both the majority and minority of the committee.

HAROLD KNUTSON has proved himself qualified to take a place in the roster of other distinguished chairmen who have preceded him. I consider it a great honor to have worked with him, to have had the benefit of his counsel and cooperation and I look forward to future years in which our mutual associations will continue.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, of all of those who have risen to national prominence in the public service during our times, none is held in higher respect or warmer affection than is Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, present-day chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means. The high esteem in which he is held in the hearts and minds of his colleagues did not come by chance. Under every test to which a legislator can be subjected, he has been found worthy of the trust and confidence of which others have spoken so earnestly.

Because I, as a Member of the House of Representatives for 14 years and of the great Committee on Ways and Means for ten, have had an exceptional opportunity to appraise the works and measure the character of this great and good man, I have no hesitancy in joining the many others who have risen from their seats to honor him on this touching occasion, each one in his turn to proclaim him one of the great legislators of our times, one whose name and accomplishments will ever be written large in the annals of this Republic.

The steadfastness with which he adheres to that which he conceives to be right; the intelligence and driving force which he throws behind that which he considers good; the successes which he has achieved in the promotion of the general welfare, will mark him indelibly as a courageous, fearless, able and very efficient representative of the people. In his effective management of the public business, he commands the admiration of the entire membership, regardless of political affiliation.

But aside from all this, the elements of his character which have won for him so large a place in the hearts of his colleagues, are found in his, the lovable personality of an ingenuous man; his quick sympathy for the weak and oppressed; his helping hand which is ever extended to those who are troubled; his words of encouragement to the despondent; his spontaneous wit and rollicking good fellowship which is so quickly revealed as the dark clouds fade from the once troubled skies and good men can once again make merry. No one is poor who can claim such a man as his friend.

So I, with all of the others, am happy to rise and to salute HAROLD KNUTSON, the genial gentleman from Minnesota. There is not, there could not be, a finer, a better, a more lovable man. May his life be long and full of happiness; his public service, with success and honors great, for, indeed, no one is more deserving of these.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, membership on a major congressional committee entails much work and study. Membership on the great Ways and Means Committee, of which Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, is chairman, is no exception.

A chairman can do much toward making a record for the committee. We believe that HAROLD KNUTSON has set a new high mark in that capacity. Under his leadership the work of the Ways and Means Committee has been most effective and harmonious. In expressing its appreciation the committee on June 17, 1948, assembled in special meeting to tell our chairman our feelings toward him.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pleasure I take advantage of this opportunity to commend the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, for his constructive work and aggressive leadership, as well as for the fair and impartial manner in which he has conducted the committee. His years of service as an outstanding statesman bears witness to his enterprise and initiative and industry. He has contributed much to the welfare of this Nation, giving a guaranty of a greater and more splendid future for our country.

It has been a real pleasure to work with Mr. KNUTSON, and I hope our paths may cross often in the future. He has my best wishes for his continued health, happiness, and success.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement made by me in presenting a resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means in honor of the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, which was unanimously adopted:

Mr. Chairman, I have served as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means for about 24 years and was its chairman for 14 years. Prior to becoming chairman, I have served on the committee with the following chairmen: Hon. William Green, of Iowa; Hon. William Collier, of Mississippi; and Hon. Charles Crisp, of Georgia, who was acting chairman during the illness of Chairman Collier.

In my opinion our present chairman, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, is the equal of any chairman within my experience in point of ability and the fine service he has rendered as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means since the opening of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. KNUTSON has also extended to me many personal courtesies and kindnesses which I shall always appreciate and I offered the resolution which was adopted unanimously,

expressing our high estimate and profound appreciation of the wonderful record made by Chairman KNUTSON.

Mr. KNUTSON is not only an excellent chairman but a great legislator and an outstanding American citizen who is rendering most unusual service to our Nation.

Mr. KNUTSON. My friends, I am deeply touched by your action. No man is better qualified to bear testimony on the greatness of this wonderful country and the many opportunities it has to offer to those who are willing to work and strive for advancement than am I, who was born in a foreign land.

I well recall, as a small boy, how our beloved mother would gather her brood of little ones about her each night preparatory to being put to bed. Placing her arms about us she offered up the evening prayer and always that prayer included a note of thanksgiving to Providence for having permitted our family to come to this wonderful country where each and every one is free to carve out his own career. I learned at her bedside the great lesson of Americanism, and if at times it may have appeared that I am strongly nationalist it is altogether due to the fact that I love my country and am zealous of her welfare.

George Washington's admonition to us to avoid entangling alliances has ever had the force of a command from on high for me.

Being chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, an honor that had never before come to my great State, carries with it heavy responsibilities, as you well know.

My sainted mother often impressed upon our young and plastic minds that life is like a bank account and we can draw on that account only as much as we put into it. It was a proud moment in my mother's life when I was first sworn in as a Member of Congress, but it was not the pride of position. Rather, it was pride that her son had been placed in a position where he could be of service to others, and during my long tenure here I have always looked upon my position as an opportunity to be of service to others. How well I have succeeded is not for me to say.

As chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee I have tried to be fair and helpful to my colleagues. I am happy to say that except when party issues were involved there has been little partisanship in our deliberations and in our labors. All were animated by the same lofty ideal—to render the best and greatest possible service to the land that we love and which has done so much for each and every one of us.

May I say at this point that the loyal and effective help of my old and most valued friend, Mr. DOUGHTON, has contributed much to whatever measure of success I may have attained as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. His wise counsel has on more than one occasion smoothed the way for reporting necessary legislation. My friend places country above party, which is the hallmark of statesmanship. He has served longer as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means than any other—a fine tribute to a fine gentleman.

Regardless of my future plans I shall ever cherish the memory of the friendships formed while a member of our great committee. To me the recollection of my service here will ever be a cherished memory.

In closing, let me again thank you from the bottom of my heart for the fine cooperation you have always given me. It was your helpfulness that enabled me to carry on and garner whatever success that has been attained. In return I wish for each and every one of you life's richest blessings, peace of mind, good health, happiness, and length of years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

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

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

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

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to have printed in the RECORD the majority and minority report in the election contest of Wilson versus Granger.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the general subject of the REA and AAA legislation, including his own roll call records, letters, communications, and newspaper articles.

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

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

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

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made today on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill and include certain letters and telegrams.

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 691, Rept. No. 2415), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized, empowered, and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission with a view to determining whether or not such Commission in its organization, in the selection and appointment of personnel, and in the conduct of its functions and activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest, including (but not limiting the foregoing authority) a study and investigation of the Commission's licensing and license-renewal activities; the Commission's power and authority, if any, to promulgate and issue its so-called Blue Book and the extent to which, if any, the same has been, or is being, used as the basis or excuse for regulation by the Commission, directly or indirectly, of radio-program content at licensed radio stations; whether the Commission has licensed, or proposes to license, any radio station or stations owned or controlled by persons who are members of, or affiliated with, subversive or Communist-front organizations or who might permit the facilities of such radio stations to be used contrary to the public interest; and whether there has been, or is, any concerted movement or effort to procure the concentration of radio-station licenses, including FM, AM, and television, in the hands of a limited class of persons or concerns rather than a distribution of such licenses on a geographical and equitable basis, as provided by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at the earliest practicable date, for during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present session of Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, records, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

POSTAL RATE REVISION AND SALARY ACT OF 1948

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be cited as the "Postal Rate Revision and Salary Act of 1948."

TITLE I—ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTMASTERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FIELD SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 101. All postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal service whose rates of

compensation are prescribed by the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of $450 per annum: *Provided*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 25 cents per hour: *Provided further*, That postmasters at post offices of the fourth class shall receive additional compensation at the rate of a sum per annum equal to 25 per centum of their basic annual compensation.

SEC. 102. The provisions of this act shall not apply to skilled-trades employees of the mail-equipment shops, job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices, and employees who are paid on a fee or contract basis.

SEC. 103. This title shall take effect as of July 1, 1948.

TITLE II—POSTAL RATE REVISION

AIR MAIL

SEC. 201. The rate of postage on all domestic air mail as defined in Public Law 730, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall except in the case of postal cards and private mailing or post cards, be 6 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof. The rate of postage on postal cards and private mailing or post cards (conforming to the conditions prescribed by the act entitled "An act to amend the postal laws relating to use of postal cards", approved May 19, 1898 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 39, sec. 281)), when sent by air mail, shall be 4 cents each.

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

SEC. 202. The rate of postage on third-class matter shall be 2 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof, and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof up to and including 8 ounces in weight, except that the rate of postage on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants not exceeding 8 ounces in weight shall be 1½ cents for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That upon payment of a fee of $10 for each calendar year or portion thereof and under such regulations as the Postmaster General may establish for the collection of the lawful revenue and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails, it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails, separately addressed identical pieces of third-class matter in quantities of not less than 20 pounds, or of not less than 200 pieces, subject to pound rates of postage applicable to the entire bulk mailed at one time: *Provided further*, That the rate of postage on third-class matter mailed in bulk under the foregoing provision shall be 14 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent, except that in the case of books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants the rate shall be 10 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent: *And provided further*, That pieces or packages of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distributing throughout shall be subject to a minimum charge of 3 cents each.

CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS

SEC. 203. Publications containing 24 pages or more issued at regular intervals of four or more times a year, 25 percent or more of whose pages are devoted to text or reading matter and not more than 75 percent to advertising matter, which are circulated free or mainly free, may, upon authorization by the Postmaster General and under such regulations as he may prescribe, be accepted for mailing at the postage rate of 10 cents a pound or fraction thereof, computed on the entire bulk mailed at one time, but not less than 1 cent per piece, provided the copies of such publications are presented for mailing made up according to States, cities, and routes as directed by the Postmaster General: *Provided*, That publications owned and controlled by one or several individuals or business concerns and conducted as an auxiliary to and essentially for the advancement of the main business or calling of those who own or control them shall not be accepted under this section.

FOURTH-CLASS (PARCEL POST) MAIL

SEC. 204. (a) On fourth-class matter (limit of weight over 8 ounces to 70 pounds) the rate of postage except as herein provided for catalogs (limit of weight over 8 ounces up to and including 10 pounds), books, and library books, shall be by the pound as hereinafter provided, the postage in all cases to be prepaid by stamps affixed thereto or as otherwise prescribed by the Postmaster General.

(b) The rate of postage on matter of the fourth class shall be as follows:

(1) On all matter mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and on all matter mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and three-fourth cent for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by the shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is 300 miles or more in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 12 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 2⅒ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 2 cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(3) For delivery within the third zone, 13 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 2⅗ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 14 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 4½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 4¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 5½ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 16 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 7½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 7¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 17 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 9½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 9¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 18 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 11½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 11¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(9) On parcels measuring more than 84 inches but not more than 100 inches in length and girth combined the minimum postage charge shall be the zone charge applicable to a 10-pound parcel.

(c) Catalogs and similar printed advertising matter in bound form weighing more than 8 ounces but not exceeding 10 pounds shall be subject to postage rates based on the eight parcel-post zones as follows:

(1) When mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and when mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 7½ cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound.

(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by the shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is 300 miles or more in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(3) For delivery within the third zone, 9 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 2 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 2½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 12 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 13 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 14 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(d) Books, permanently bound for preservation consisting wholly of reading matter or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for student's notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books and when in parcels not exceeding 70 pounds in weight, may be sent at the postage rate of 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(e) Books, consisting wholly of reading matter and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, when sent by public libraries, organizations, or associations not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, as a service to county or other unit libraries or as a loan to readers or when returned by the latter libraries or readers to such public libraries, organizations, or associations shall be charged with postage at the rate of 4 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof, except that the rates now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection for books under this classification: *Provided*, That this rate shall apply only to such books as are addressed for local delivery, for delivery in the first, second, or third zone, or within the State in which mailed. Public libraries, organizations, or associations before being entitled to the foregoing rates shall furnish to the Postmaster General,

under such regulations as he may prescribe, satisfactory evidence that none of their net income inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.

(f) To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable of mail matter of the fourth class, special-handling stamps shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than 2 pounds, 15 cents; matter weighing more than 2 but not more than 10 pounds, 20 cents; matter weighing more than 10 pounds, 25 cents: *Provided*, That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-handling stamps herein specified.

SPECIAL DELIVERY

SEC. 205. To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable and the immediate delivery of mail matter at the office of address, special-delivery stamps shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than 2 pounds, if of the first class, 15 cents; if of any other class, 25 cents. Matter weighing more than 2 but not more than 10 pounds, if of the first class, 25 cents; if of any other class, 35 cents. Matter weighing more than 10 pounds, if of the first class, 35 cents; if of any other class, 45 cents: *Provided*, That under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary postage stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-delivery stamps.

MONEY ORDERS

SEC. 206. A money order shall not be issued for more than $100, and the fees for domestic money order shall be as follows: For orders less than $5.01, 10 cents; for orders from $5.01 up to and including $10, 15 cents; for orders from $10.01 up to and including $50, 25 cents; for orders from $50.01 up to and including $100, 35 cents.

POSTAL NOTES

SEC. 207. (a) The Postmaster General may authorize postmasters at such offices as he shall designate, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to issue and pay money orders not exceeding $10, to be known as postal notes. The fee for insurance thereof shall be 8 cents each.

(b) Postal notes shall be valid for two calendar months from the last day of the month of their issue; but thereafter may be paid by the Postmaster General or refund may be made in case of loss, upon evidence satisfactory to him, under such regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That no claim for the amount of a postal note will be considered unless filed within 1 year from the last day of the month of issue. Postal notes shall not be negotiable or transferable through endorsement.

REGISTERED MAIL

SEC. 208. (a) Mail matter shall be registered on the application of the party posting the same. The registry fees, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this subsection, shall be as follows: For registry indemnity not exceeding $5, 25 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25, 35 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50, 40 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $75, 45 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $75 but not exceeding $100, 50 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200, 60 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300, 70 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400, 85 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500, $1; for registry indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600, $1.10; for registry indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700, $1.20; for registry indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800, $1.30; for registry indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $900, $1.40; for registry indemnity exceeding $900 but not exceeding $1,000, $1.50.

(b) For registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid, there shall be charged additional fees (known as "surcharges") as follows: When the declared value exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid by not more than $50, 2 cents; by more than $50 but not more than $100, 3 cents; by more than $100 but not more than $200, 4 cents; by more than $200 but not more than $400, 6 cents; by more than $400 but not more than $600, 7 cents; by more than $600 but not more than $800, 8 cents; by more than $800 but less than $1,000, 10 cents. If the excess of the declared value over the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid is $1,000 or more, the additional fees for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows: For local delivery or, for delivery within the first zone, 11 cents; for delivery within the second zone, 12 cents; for delivery within the third zone, 14 cents; for delivery within the fourth zone, 15 cents; for delivery within the fifth or sixth zone, 16 cents; for delivery within the seventh or eighth zone, 18 cents.

(c) For insured mail treated as registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid, there shall be charged additional fees (known as "surcharges") as follows: When the declared value exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid by not more than $50, 1 cent; by more than $50 but not more than $100, 2 cents; by more than $100 but not more than $200, 3 cents; by more than $200 but not more than $400, 4 cents; by more than $400 but not more than $600, 5 cents; by more than $600 but not more than $800, 6 cents; by more than $800 but less than $1,000, 7 cents. If the excess of the declared value over the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid is $1,000 or more, the additional fee for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows: For local delivery or for delivery within the first zone, 8 cents; for delivery within the second zone, 9 cents; for delivery within the third zone, 10 cents; for delivery within the fourth zone, 11 cents; for delivery within the fifth or sixth zone, 12 cents; for delivery within the seventh or eighth zone, 13 cents.

(d) All such fees shall be accounted for in such manner as the Postmaster General shall direct. Mail matter for the official business of the Post Office Department which requires registering shall be registered free of charge, and pass through the mails free of charge.

RETURN RECEIPTS FOR REGISTERED MAIL

SEC. 209. Whenever the sender of any registered mail shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 5 cents at the time of mailing or of 10 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 26 cents at the time of mailing of any such registered mail, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for registered mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

FEES FOR INSURED MAIL

SEC. 210. The fees for insurance, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this section, shall be as follows: 5 cents for indemnification not exceeding $5; 10 cents for indemnification exceeding $5 but not exceeding $10; 15 cents for indemnification exceeding $10 but not exceeding $25; 20 cents for indemnification exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 25 cents for indemnification exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 30 cents for indemnification exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200. Whenever the sender of an insured article of mail shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 5 cents at the time of mailing or of 10 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 26 cents at the time of mailing of any such insured article of mail, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for insured mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

FEES FOR COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

SEC. 211. The fees for collect-on-delivery service for sealed domestic mail matter of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate and for domestic third- or fourth-class mail matter shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be as follows: 20 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $2.50; 25 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $2.50 but not exceeding $5; 35 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25; 45 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 55 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 60 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $150; and 65 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $150 but not exceeding $200. The fee for notifying the sender or his representative of inability to deliver a collect-on-delivery article shall be 5 cents.

RESTRICTION IN DELIVERY

SEC. 212. The Postmaster General, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to collect an additional fee of 20 cents for effecting the delivery by carrier or otherwise of domestic registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail, the delivery of which is restricted to the addressee only, or to the addressee or order: *Provided*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for this service unless request for refund is made and erroneous delivery of the article or articles was made by the postal service or nondelivery of the article or articles was due to some fault of the postal service.

REGISTERED COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

SEC. 213. (a) The fee for collect-on-delivery service for registered sealed domestic mail of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be 55 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $10; 70 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $10 but not exceeding $50; 90 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; and $1.15 for collections and indemnity exceeding

$100 but not exceeding $200. The maximum amount of charges collectible on any registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery article shall be $200.

(b) When indemnity in excess of $200 is desired, the fee for such registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery mail shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be $1.20 for indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300; $1.25 for indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400; $1.30 for indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500; $1.35 for indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600; $1.40 for indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700; $1.45 for indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800; and $1.55 for indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 214. This title shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose of this legislation to provide a permanent increase of $450 per year in the salaries of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department and to offset a portion of the increased cost by an increase in postal rates.

Title I of this bill is concerned with a salary increase for postal employees. Under the provisions of title I employees paid on an annual basis will receive a $450 permanent increase in their annual salary. Increases are provided for employees paid on an hourly basis in the amount of 25 cents an hour and for fourth-class postmasters of 25 percent. First-, second-, and third-class postmasters will receive the $450 annual increase given other postal employees.

The increase for fourth-class postmasters is provided on a percentage basis because, as you know, for many of these postmasters the return for their services from the Post Office Department is not the major portion of their income. Fourth-class post offices are the smaller post offices which have gross receipts varying from $100 per year to a top of $1,500 per year. Since fourth-class postmasters are paid based upon their gross receipts, you can see that it would be completely out of proportion to increase their salaries on other than a percentage basis.

The committee devoted much time and study to the problem of increased salaries for postal employees. Testimony presented to the committee by postal employees' national organizations stressed the necessity of a salary increase based upon the recent increase in the cost of living.

To offset part of the rising cost of living in the past, postal employees in the field service of the Post Office Department to whom this bill applies have been granted two substantial permanent pay raises. The first was the adjustment in salaries and classifications under Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, amounting to $400 annually for each postal employee beginning July 1, 1945. The second was under Public Law 386, Seventy-ninth Congress, which granted an additional permanent salary increase of $400 a year, effective January 1, 1946.

In connection with its efforts to secure a meeting of the minds between the executive and legislative branches with respect to this problem, the committee requested the Bureau of the Budget and the Postmaster General to submit reports concerning pay-raise legislation.

In his budget message to the Congress in January 1948 the President stated that he was not recommending cost-of-living increases in pay for Federal civilian employees. The President stated:

> The rapid increase in living costs during the last 18 months has placed a serious burden on these groups. Yet, to offset the cost-of-living increase since the last time pay or benefit rates were advanced for each group would add at least $2,400,000,000 to budget expenditures in 1949—apart from increases that would be paid from the trust funds. This large expenditure would add greatly to the inflationary pressure in our economy.

Further, the committee secured a report from the Bureau of the Budget, the right arm of the President, with respect to pay raises for Federal employees, dated July 1, 1947, which stated:

> In view of the recent substantial increases in the base pay rates of Federal employees generally, it appears that these rates for the lower and middle pay brackets are now fairly well in line with salaries outside the Government.

In an additional report, dated February 25, 1948, the Bureau of the Budget stated:

> In reply, you are advised that by reason of the position taken by the President in his budget message of January 12, 1948, on this subject, it is not believed that the enactment of the proposed legislation (salary increases for postal workers) could be considered, at least at this time, as being in accord with the program of the President.

At hearings conducted by the committee, the Postmaster General stated:

> We have to rest upon the President's budget message to the Congress.

As the Members of the House can see, the committee has had little cooperation from the executive branch with respect to working out a fair solution to pay increases for postal employees. Yet, our committee undertook to approach this problem realistically, and title I of this bill providing for a $450 annual increase in the salaries of postal workers is, in the judgment of our committee, the best solution to this problem.

In my opinion—and I am sure this view is shared by the members of the committee—our faithful postal workers richly deserve this permanent increase in their base salaries.

It is true that the cost of the bill will be approximately $211,000,000 annually. However, title II of the bill provides for recovering approximately $125,000,000 of this cost by moderate increases in postal rates and postal services. The $450 increase is probably not as much as the postal workers desire. However, it is a permanent increase; and taking into consideration the fact that the Congress has, within the past 3 years, approved increases amounting to $800 a year, the committee believed the increase is fair and equitable.

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, our majority floor leader.

Mr. HALLECK. What is the estimated deficit in the post office for this year?

Mr. REES. I understand the estimated deficit is approximately $375,000,000 at the present time.

Mr. HALLECK. I commend the gentleman and his committee on bringing in a bill that contains in it, in addition to the pay raise, a provision for raising at least a substantial part of the money, because obviously we cannot go on and on having deficits in the Post Office constantly increasing.

Mr. REES. The President in his budget message in January stressed the need for increased postal rates to meet the large deficit, presently running to $375,000,000 annually. I may say, however, that the Post Office Department has suggested much larger increases in rates than are proposed in this legislation. However, our committee tried to be practical about this matter and to be fair to all parties concerned. For that reason we have brought in what we believe to be moderate rate increases in dealing with this problem.

The President in his budget messages in 1947 and 1948 has stressed the need for increasing postal rates to meet the large postal deficit. The Postmaster General on March 23, 1948, recommended to the Congress increases in postal rates which would have raised revenues of $243,970,000. In the opinion of the committee the rates recommended by the Postmaster General are more in some categories than should be imposed upon the users of the mail at this time. The rates contained in title II of the bill provide for increases for the considerably lower amount of $124,225,000. These increases for the categories of mail and postal services included in the bill are as follows:

	Amount of proposed increase
1. Air mail (domestic)	$9,850,000
2. Circulars, printed matter, seeds, etc., in parcels weighing less than 8 ounces (third-class mail)	14,600,000
3. Parcel post	60,500,000
4. Catalogs	2,400,000
5. Books	3,300,000
6. Special handling	300,000
7. Special delivery	3,600,000
8. Money orders	17,500,000
9. Postal notes	1,650,000
10. Registered mail	4,200,000
11. Insurance	3,575,000
12. C. o. d. service	3,300,000

AIR MAIL

At the present time we are experiencing an annual loss of $18,000,000 in handling air mail. As I have stated, increasing the rate on air mail from 5 to 6 cents will increase the revenue by approximately $10,000,000.

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

Third-class mail is circulars, printed matter, seeds, bulbs, and so forth, sent in parcels of less than 8 ounces. A special rate is provided in this classification for seeds and bulbs. Also there is a special rate provided for bulk mailers sending more than 200 uniform items at one mailing. In this bill there is no change of the 1-cent minimum rate charged for these bulk mailings. The increase in this rate comes in the smaller mailings of third-class mail and an increase in the pound rate of 2 cents. The third-class mailers have expressed themselves as being favorable to H. R. 3519 and I believe I can say they have been quite generously treated in this bill.

FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

Fourth-class mail has several subcategories—parcel post, catalogs, books and library books. Fourth-class mail is required to pay its own way according to present law. The Postmaster General, under this law which still remains in effect, is directed to increase parcel-post rates through a procedure involving the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission whenever revenues do not equal expenditures for handling parcel post. We have been experiencing for the past several years a large loss in parcel post and I have brought this fact to the attention of the Postmaster General. It has been his position that since Congress has under consideration a revision in parcel-post rates he is delaying taking proper action under the law. I have noted that the Senate Committee on Appropriations has also brought this fact to his attention and requested that he take action. The loss in parcel post in 1947 was $41,000,000. The rates provided in this bill will increase revenues in parcel post by $60,000,000. We must consider, of course, at the same time, this bill is increasing cost to the postal service so that with the increased rates the revenues from parcel post should approximate the expenditures in this class of mail.

There has also been a lot of controversy whenever the question of book rate increases is considered. In this respect I should like to point out that books are, after all, merchandise, and as a matter of fact they are carried under regular parcel-post rates. Books do not have a high time priority and in the majority of cases, could actually go by freight instead of expensive postal service. For this reason it does not appear that the Post Office Department should be carrying books at a great loss. The proposed increases on books leave them at a flat rate, that is, there is the same charge for sending a book across the country as there is for sending it into the next county. This flat rate is justified because book printing is concentrated in a few areas and it is felt that this does assist in a wide distribution of books. Even with these increased rates on books, we will still be carrying them at less than cost.

Most of the other increases concern postal services. I do not believe there has been as much controversy over increasing these rates as over increasing rates for mail.

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, one of the distinguished members of our committee who has worked very diligently in trying to work out this problem.

Mr. COMBS. First I want to say that in my judgment no committee of the House has done its work more conscientiously or more studiously avoided partisanship than the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Our distinguished chairman has been patient and worked hard and every member of the committee, Republicans and Democrats, has worked hard to report out fair, well-considered bills for enactment. It is true, is it not, that a great deal of the deficit of the Post Office Department is occasioned by the fact that we use that Department as an agency to subsidize air mail and even the railroads in the carrying of mail. In other words, the money appropriated for the Post Office Department is not all used in expanding the mail service, but some in subsidies to build air lines and things of that kind.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I think he well knows that our committee has made a strenuous effort to separate those two proposals. We subsidize the air lines through the Post Office when we should subsidize them separately. We do have a policy that has been adopted whereby it is agreed that the air lines shall be supported in order to provide for commerce and national defense.

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

Mr. REES. I yield again to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it would be well for the RECORD if the gentleman would state the amount of that subsidy. Certainly it does not begin to amount to as much as the over-all deficit in the Post Office.

Mr. REES. As near as it can be figured out, the subsidy amounts to between 15 and 20 million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state that we are increasing air mail 1 cent. Third-class mail, which includes circulars, printed matter, seeds, and parcels weighing less than 8 ounces, is being increased. With reference to fourth-class mail, which includes catalogs and books, under the law as it now stands the rates on fourth-class mail should be sufficiently high so it will pay its own way. It is the responsibility of the Postmaster General to initiate such rate revision with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They have failed to act.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Do you propose in this bill to fix rates without having had any hearings on those rates?

Mr. REES. I will say to the gentleman that we held hearings for weeks and weeks on these matters. This bill has been pending in the Committee on Rules for exactly 13 months.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Is that with reference to rates?

Mr. REES. We held hearings and the first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail people came in and testified. We have reams of testimony on this.

Mr. GWINN of New York. On rates?

Mr. REES. Oh, yes, indeed. We have them all in. We have full and complete hearings on this. It has been threshed up one side and down the other.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, a member of our committee.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to state that all during the Seventy-ninth Congress, our committee held hearings on the question of increasing rates. We spent about 3 years trying to provide a means of fixing postal rates.

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, a former member of the Post Office Committee of the House.

Mr. BREHM. To answer the question of the gentleman from New York, hearings were held on this legislation when I was a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. To tell you the truth, I regret that I am no longer a member of that committee.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. The problem has been threshed out over and over again.

I want to pay tribute to the members of our committee on both sides, each and every one of them, for the splendid effort they put forth in trying to reach a solution of this very important problem. Some of the rates included in this bill perhaps ought to be adjusted. However, we did the best we could in an effort to bring equitable legislation to attention. We ask for your approval of this legislation.

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, who has for some time been looking into this problem.

Mr. BUSBEY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised and disappointed to learn that the bill we have under consideration to increase the salaries of postal employees only provides for an annual increase of $450.

The Members of this House know I am just as economy-minded as anyone else and that I try to guard the taxpayers' money very diligently.

The facts are simply these: It has been a disgrace and a shame the lack of consideration that has been given postal employees for many, many years. They are a group whose patriotism has never been challenged. They stuck to their jobs through the war years when it would have been to their advantage to go into war plants where they could have made large salaries. Because of the low wage scale now paid postal employees,

they have had to secure work on the outside after hours in order to make enough money to meet their family expenses. In many cases they could not hang on any longer because of the heavy expenses, notwithstanding the fact that they would have liked to retain their positions with the Post Office.

I say to you in all sincerity that if we can send billions and billions and then more billions of dollars to Europe, most of which is squandered and for which we shall never get any return or benefit, the least amount that should be granted the faithful postal employees is an increase of $600 per year.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as has been explained by the able chairman of our committee, this bill does two things: It provides a permanent increase of $450 per year to all postal employees except those employees who are paid by the hour, and to fourth-class postmasters. Those employees who are paid by the hour get a raise of 25 cents per hour. The fourth-class postmasters get an increase of 25 percent in their present compensation.

Second, the bill provides for an increase in postage rates. It affects all classes of rates except second-class mail.

The committee thought those rates for second-class mail should be increased, because at the present time the Post Office Department is losing $160,000,000 on the carriage of second-class mail. But be that as it may, the increase in the other postage rates in this bill will produce about $124,000,000 in additional revenue. The cost of the increase in salaries of the postal employees in this bill will be about $211,000,000 per year. There are approximately 480,000 employees in the postal service. So the revenue brought in by the increase in postage rates in this bill will be about $85,000,000 less than the cost of the increases in salaries.

Let me say in the beginning your committee brought in a bill which provided $585 temporary increase per annum for the postal employees, but the powers that be would not permit that bill to be considered, and we were required to bring in another bill, making the salary increase $450.

This increase is deserved. It is just. It is fair to meet the increased cost of living. From 1923 to 1945 our postal employees had no increases. On July 1, 1945, they were given $400 a year increase. In 1946 they were given another $400 increase. This increase of $450 now is certainly needed to help these employees pay their increased cost of living.

To my mind, there is no more faithful, no more just, no more loyal group of employees in our Government service than our postal employees. There is another bill pending in the House. It is H. R. 6917. It provides compensation to other employees of our Government, other than postal employees. There is a rule on this bill, and I trust that the majority leadership will permit consideration of this measure also.

Mr. Speaker, it would be grossly unjust, unfair, and discriminatory to increase the payments to postal employees and not to increase the pay for other Federal employees.

The Republican leadership has always been fair and considerate, and I implore the Republican leadership to permit this House, before the sun sets this evening, to pass H. R. 6917, increasing the compensation of other Federal employees.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. Is it not true that our distinguished chairman, when he originally introduced the bill, had all Federal employees in one bill, and "the powers that be," to use your expression, required a separation?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is exactly correct.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. I am happy to see these postal rates increased. I thoroughly agree in the gentleman's hope that this Congress will not adjourn until other classified employees, Government workers, are given this much-needed raise.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENNINGS. I wish to commend the very fine work the committee has done in bringing out this bill in behalf of the employees of the postal service, and especially my colleague from Tennessee who has rendered hard and meritorious work in a good cause.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for his kind words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LOVE].

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of legislation providing for a permanent increase of $450 annually to our hard-working and very deserving postal workers.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have received many requests from all parts of the United States asking that the proposed increase should be at least $800. I regret that it is not possible to reach this figure. However, I wish to call to the attention of all postal employees that they will receive a substantial income-tax reduction as of January last. This reduction should amount to about $100 annually to the average letter carrier. Therefore, your raise will, in effect, be approximately $550 for those who pay Federal income taxes.

We have also amended the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase annuity benefits 25 percent, or $300.

In providing a permanent pay raise of $450, a greatly improved retirement system, and a substantial income-tax reduction, I, for one, am not ashamed of what the Eightieth Congress has done for our loyal postal employees.

This proposed legislation will cost the Federal Government approximately $203,000,000. The bill also includes increased mail rates to provide estimated additional revenue of approximately $124,000,000. During fiscal 1947, the United States Post Office Department operated at an approximate loss of $300,000,000. It should be pointed out here, very clearly, that the Post Office Department is one of the few Government agencies that provides revenue. Since our Post Office Department should be considered partly as a great public service to our people and to our Republic, I do not believe that we should criticize it too severely if it does not pay its way in full. What Government agency does pay its way? We should also realize that it costs money to service our vast amount of penalty and free mail. However, a large portion of the United States mails are used strictly for business and commercial purposes. This service should not be donated. Many rates should be increased to help decrease the deficit in the Department and to partially support a deserved increase for the postal employees.

In fiscal 1947, air mail operated at a loss of almost $19,000,000. This bill proposes a rate increase from 5 cents to 6 cents, which would increase revenues by about $10,000,000. Parcel post lost $41,000,000 in 1947 and the proposed rate increase of 28 percent would provide an additional $60,000,000. Money orders lost $32,000,000 and a 50-percent increase would add $17,000,000. COD service lost $6,000,000, and a 20-percent increase proposes revenues of more than $3,000,000.

Third-class mail, including circulars, seeds, and so forth, lost $74,000,000, and an 18-percent increase would provide some $14,000,000. Other rate increases, not including second-class mail, aggregate a total increase of revenue to some $124,000,000.

I repeat, in conclusion, that the United States Post Office should be considered as a great public service and that we should not expect it to operate entirely out of the red. However, insofar as strictly commercial postal rates are concerned, these rates should be increased as in the present bill to eliminate unjustified deficits in the Post Office Department and also to support increases to postal workers.

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

Mr. LOVE. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. I am heartily in favor of the immediate passage of H. R. 6916 under suspension of the rules and take this opportunity to commend the untiring efforts and persistence of our committee chairman, the likable, distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Much deserving and meritorious legislation has emanated from our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the Eightieth Congress. Predominantly deserving, however, is this bill which will bring some needed economic relief to very loyal and devoted public servants, assure them that their employer is appreciative and make possible the retention of experienced employees

as well as recent appointees who decided to make careers in the post office service. It will also provide an incentive to others who hesitate in making this selection because of the entrance salary. And, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the latter, the eligible registers in every large city post office bespeak the urgent need of a change in this respect or serious difficulties may arise.

I am sure that it is well known that I worked for the passage of a larger increase of these salaries and that I also was active and deeply interested in all Federal workers and shall endeavor to get action on H. R. 6916. Knowing well the mechanics by which legislation is enacted, I urge the acceptance and approval of H. R. 6916.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVE. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I wish to commend the gentleman at this time and to express the hope that it may be possible to bring out the bill for the other Federal employees before the session ends.

Mr. Speaker, last February I appeared before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service through the courtesy of its chairman, and asked for the maximum of $1,000 salary increase which the postal workers of my district requested. I have publicly proclaimed my position again and again and flatly stated these deserving people must have first consideration.

The postal employees that I represent made it plain to me they want a larger raise than we are giving them today. I think they are right.

However, the time is late, the House is adjourning, and this important matter has been held up until the last minute. There is no chance to offer amendments to increase this proposed amount of $450.

Naturally, I am happy that this raise is presented and I gladly support it. I know all the post office people at home will be glad the increase has been brought up.

For some time I was apprehensive over the protests my office received from postal workers each time I returned home. They were honest protests from heads of families who find it difficult to meet the rising cost of living. They were righteous complaints from employees, long faithful to the Post Office Department, who had seen other departments get raises and yet got no satisfaction themselves.

I repeat I am glad to have a part in passing this pay-raise bill today. It is a step in the right direction and spells a measure of justice to our deserving postal workers.

The second part of the bill, I regret I cannot support. It has to do with raising rates of the parcel post. I think they are already too high.

Perhaps it is good politics, but I know many businessmen who will object to having these rates raised. Personally I do not think this rate increase is necessary and I have the right to my opinion. I regret no chance is given here to amend this section or I would certainly try to do so.

The postal pay raise is timely, well-deserved, and necessary. The men I know at home will be grateful and I have looked forward with great anticipation to giving them this lift. I take pleasure in voting for the postal employees' pay raise here today.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I share with the splendid chairman and the outstanding members of the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service the responsibility of bringing you well-considered legislation in an orderly and democratic manner. We are proud of our record. Unfortunately, we cannot be proud of this bill and, personally, I can accept no compliments from the leadership of the Republican Party for it. It is not a committee bill. We are but the instrument by which the majority policy committee impresses its ideas upon the House in this particular legislation. You, too, have been disfranchised and stripped of the power to offer your ideas as representatives of millions of American people—it cannot be amended. Those responsible for the bill saw to that.

I have always cherished orderly democratic procedure by which the majority may express its will. Such is not the case here, for this is the will of a few. In my judgment the arbitrary use of power by a small group, be it policy or otherwise, which renders a majority of the membership impotent, notwithstanding the character and integrity of the individuals involved, is contrary and harmful to the fundamentals of American representative government. Yet witness such at this hour.

At the beginning of the Eightieth Congress your committee began to study the advisability of increasing Federal salaries for postal workers and others. We held extensive hearings and worked long hours attempting to arrive at justice for the Government and the employee. Many weeks ago your committee recommended favorably the passage of legislation increasing the salaries of postal workers and other Federal workers. The increases recommended were not in the amounts asked, nor were they equal to the increased cost of living. The bills were, however, carefully considered, and while they did not meet with my full approval, they did express the majority opinion of the committee. You have not had and will not have an opportunity to pass upon either of these measures. They lie dormant in the Rules Committee.

More than 14 months ago your committee, after months of careful and deliberate study, recommended postal rate increases. This bill represented the best thought of the members of a committee who had spent months, and many of them, years, studying the problem with no other purpose than the development of a postal system and service that could adequately meet the demands of this great country at rates the people can afford to pay, and with as little loss as possible to the Government. This bill is before the Rules Committee and has been for more than 1 year.

Your chairman and your committee, without political consideration, have attempted to discharge their responsibilities to you and to the people in a useful and helpful manner. I could not praise the committee membership too highly.

Does this bill before you today represent the work and thought of your committee? I regret to say that it does not.

Briefly, I will give you its story. It came as a surprise and a shock to me a very few days ago when it was placed on the doorstep of the committee with word, supposedly from the Republican policy committee—and I do not question its source—which was in the nature of an ultimatum: This or nothing.

It is quite popular, and has been, to use Federal employees as whipping boys. Unquestionably we employ more than are necessary. Unfortunately some are not worthy of their trust and responsibility and do not earn their pay. But I will not join with any demagogic harrangue against the hundreds of thousands of necessary, able, and faithful employees who make possible the orderly functioning of this great Government. They are entitled to the consideration that should be given to every faithful worker of private industry or public service. Hundreds of thousands of Government employees are suffering with millions of Americans as a result of the unprecedented, unchecked, and, assuredly, unfortunate spiral of living costs.

Federal employees must depend entirely upon this Congress for relief. They have no right to strike; they have no right to participate as a body or in groups in politics; they are limited to the interest, thoughtfulness, fairness, and consideraiton of you gentlemen. I feel constrained to compliment the employees, particularly those who have contacted me, for they have been courteous, patient, considerate, and reasonable and they have, under no circumstances, attempted to put pressure upon me, personally or through the mails. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not the bill that should be before the House.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Texas for his very fine statement. I would also like to compliment the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], chairman of the full committee, for reporting out two bills granting pay increases not only to postal employees but to all Federal employees. Had that committee been let alone, all Federal employees today would have had a good substantial pay raise which they all deserve.

Mr. LYLE. And in an orderly manner.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I had not expected to ask the gentleman to yield to me, but I have been very much interested in what he had to say.

Mr. LYLE. I hoped the gentleman would be.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman agree with me that as costs increase in the Post Office Department of necessity and as a part of the over-all budgetary

situation and the Federal Treasury, we have to pay some attention to rates?

Mr. LYLE. For 1 year we have urged the Republican policy committee to permit the consideration of the postal rate increase bill. This bill has been before the Committee on Rules since May 1947. The gentleman is just a year behind the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I join with every Member of this House in a sincere effort to cut the expenses of Government, to reduce the national debt and to help bring about a sound fiscal policy for the Government. No reasonable or thinking man, however, can argue successfully that adequate salaries for Federal employees would be inconsistent with a sound fiscal policy.

All Federal employees are entitled, in my judgment, to increases in salary at this time. There is now a bill, introduced by the great chairman of my committee, ready for consideration but without the blessing of the leadership. It provides for salary increases for classified and other Federal employees. He and the other members of my committee join me, I am sure, in wishing that you might have an opportunity to pass upon it. And with all frankness, Mr. Speaker, if I have the honor of serving on the conference committee between the two Houses, provided there is one, I shall do my utmost to bring back to the House fair increases for all Federal employees. I shall also attempt to divorce postal-rate increases from the salary bill. Postal rates are not properly made in relation to the salaries of postal employees. They cannot be. They should be considered separately and apart.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Why were not the users of second-class mail, who are responsible for the biggest deficit, included in the policy committee's statement?

Mr. LYLE. That is a question the answer to which will be somewhat embarrassing to the policy committee which omitted it from its ultimatum. The answer is, I believe, this: The Post Office Department is calculated to lose $160,000,000 on this class of mail in 1948. In my judgment, nevertheless, they could not face the great newspapers and, perhaps, magazines, which would be affected by a change in second-class mail rates in a year of political campaigns.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. The ultimatum was received notwithstanding the fact that better than 218 Members of this House, making up the majority and the minority, appeared before your committee and asked that this pay increase be granted?

Mr. LYLE. Unfortunately, this present bill failed to take into consideration the ideas of the membership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the passage of this bill for I have hopes that it may be worked into acceptable legislation before it reaches the President's desk. I could not, in good conscience, refrain from this explanation to the House of the procedure by which it comes to you. Perhaps in frank discussion we may better understand each other and more admirably serve the people who have entrusted us with great responsibilities. We shall, I am sure, always cherish the advice of the leadership of both sides of the House, but seldom shall we, I sincerely hope, subject ourselves to the dictates of either, when by doing so we thwart the will of the majority of the United States Representatives.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of my committee—a committee of which I have been a member only about 2 months—for the splendid work that he has done and is doing. He has always had the interest of the Federal workers at heart; he has had the interest of the postal workers at heart His heart is right, but his hands have been tied by the uncompromising actions of his own party's leaders. I had hoped that a bill would be brought out that would provide for adequate permanent increases for postal employees. I thought it was the duty of Congress to do so. You know, this Congress is in a large part responsible for the chaotic economic conditions which we find prevailing at the present time. I think it is our duty to provide for our Federal employees in order to help them meet the increased cost of living for which we are to some extent, at least, responsible. I cannot say that I am proud of this bill. I concur with my colleague from Texas in that, and I am not proud of the manner in which it was brought about. I contend that this bill should come to the floor under an open rule, giving the Members the opportunity to offer amendments. In this way alone could we formulate a measure that would meet the approval of most of the Members of this House.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Did I understand the legislative history of this particular bill to be that the committee reported out a bill which included both postal as well as other Federal employees, in a greater sum than mentioned in this bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true, but that was done before I became a member of the committee.

Mr. CARROLL. But that was reported out by this committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. I may say that the bills previously reported reflected more nearly the views of the majority of the committee than does this measure. This bill is brought to you as the result of an ultimatum, as the gentleman from Texas told you a few minutes ago, from the Republican Policy Committee. The leadership of the Republican Party dumped it in our laps, and told us to take it or leave it. If we leave it, our postal workers do not get a raise at all.

Mr. CARROLL. They have divided the bill and reduced the salary increase?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is exactly right.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The bill as reported by our committee did not include the other Federal employees. The bill as introduced included postal employees and Federal employees, but the bill as reported out included only the postal employees, and then a separate bill pertaining to Federal employees was reported out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my contention that the committee wanted to be more liberal. I regret that the high-handed action of the majority leadership has dictated otherwise.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H. R. 6916 and H. R. 6917, and I urge the Members of the House to pass these bills. I cannot oppose such legislation without denying to hundreds of thousands of faithful Government employees a well-deserved and hard-earned cost-of-living increase in salaries. However, I strenuously oppose the procedure used to bring these measures to you.

Although these bills are very important there were no hearings on H. R. 6916 or H. R. 6917 in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee or in any other standing committee of the House. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee which is presenting these bills to you was not even consulted about their construction.

On June 14 the Republican policy committee issued an ultimatum to our Post Office and Civil Service Committee to the effect that no salary increase bills would be passed unless they were in the form of H. R. 6916 and H. R. 6917. Other measures had already been reported out by our committee dealing with the same issues, which provided increases in salaries for postal workers, increases in postal rates, and increases in salaries for Federal employees—all based upon evidence produced during the hearings. These measures were recommended by our committee after much deliberation and in a general sense reflected the bipartisan views of a majority of the members of the committee. No action whatsoever was allowed on these measures by the Rules Committee.

H. R. 6916 is a combination of these committee bills which were previously reported out, minus very important and integral parts of these same bills. The ultimatum which eliminated vital aspects of this legislation and made substantial reductions in the salary raises usurped the prerogatives and responsibilities of your Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I believe in upholding the basic principle that legislation reported out by a major standing committee should reflect

the considered judgment of this committee, and not the coerced political expediency of an outside partisan policy committee. Mr. Speaker, this procedure is dangerous and alarming. If real democracy is to be preserved we must not resort to such tactics, and I hereby protest vigorously against this action.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my approval of the action that has just been taken by the House in granting a pay increase to postal employees. It was altogether fitting that we do this as our postal employees are among our finest and most conscientious Federal workers. Upon them rests much of the responsibility of maintaining the well-being of our Nation and it is only fair that we recognize and reward their faithful service in a highly justified material way.

It is regrettable, however, that the postal pay bill was considered under a suspension of the rules and it was not possible to have an amendment considered for a general Federal pay raise. I sincerely hope that the Senate will take action in seeing that this amendment is added when the bill is considered by that body. I favor a pay raise for all Federal employees and I will support and vote for legislation that will bring this about.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H. R. 6916, although the pay increase involved is inadequate to meet the increase in postal employees' cost of living.

I desire to record a vigorous protest against the political maneuvers which have occurred in connection with the presentation of this legislation.

There was ample evidence before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that postal employees and other Federal workers are in dire need of a salary increase adequate to meet the high cost of living. Witness after witness testified that it was imperative that these employees receive not less than a $800-per-year salary increase. Notwithstanding the overwhelming weight of this testimony, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, for reasons best known to itself, reported out separate bills—one giving the postal employees a salary increase of $585 per year and the other granting all other Federal employees a salary increase in the sum of $468 per year. Even though those salary increases were insufficient, this represented, neverthless, a reasonable step in the right direction.

The debate on the pending bill discloses a situation revealing a shocking disregard for the welfare of Federal employees and the legislative findings of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Important members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee openly have charged on the floor of this House that the Republican policy committee has used tremendous pressure to keep these bills from being brought to the floor of the House for debate and vote in the form originally presented by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The record now reveals that the bill concerning postal employees has been subjected to a salary cut from $585 to $450 per year. Moreover, the Republican policy committee has refused to consider any pay raise for other Federal employees. In addition to being subjected to this high-handed program, the Membership of this House now is forced to vote on the pending bill under what is known as a suspension of the rules. Many of the postal and other Federal employees do not understand the effect of this legislative maneuver.

Under a suspension of the rules, Members who are in favor of more equitable treatment of both postal and other Federal employees are prohibited from amending the present bill in any manner. In short, we must either accept or reject the bill in its present form.

Further, it is quite apparent to me that there will be no relief for other deserving Federal employees who are suffering from the increase in the cost of living.

There is no doubt in my mind that if the Republican leadership had permitted both bills to advance in the normal legislative process, the membership of this body would have passed the salary increase both for postal and other Federal employees with an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative history of these two bills clearly shows that there has been a denial of the democratic process in their consideration. Such action is detrimental to our system of civil service and will not inspire the confidence of Federal employees in the legislative branch of the Government. These employees are entitled to the same rights and to the same protection in meeting the increase in the cost of living as are those workers who are employed in and who have been given wage increases by private industry.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for this bill, but I am not satisfied with it. I favor an increase of $800 for postal service and other Federal employees. The talk of economy comes with poor grace from those who voted and supported our foreign policy. It comes with poor grace for those who saddled $623,000,000,000 of debts and future commitments on our shoulders by voting and supporting the 15 years of global gifts and expenditures.

I feel that this increase is inadequate to maintain the American standard of living. These employees are not able to properly take care of themselves and their families with the present 30-cent dollar that they are getting. The cost of living has gone up at least 200 percent, if not more, since 1937, 1938, and 1939.

For example, on August 11, 1939, in Fargo, N. Dak., a pound of Land O' Lakes butter was 23 cents; eggs were 2 dozen for 23 cents, strictly fresh; a pound-and-a-half loaf of bread was 9 cents; pork loin, 12 cents, bacon, 12½ cents; spare ribs, 8 cents; crisp celery, 5 cents; two heads of lettuce, 13 cents; five bunches of radishes, 5 cents; three bunches of carrots, 10 cents; 3 pounds of coffee, 39 cents; and other food and articles and wearing apparel were on a par with these prices. Compare them with today's prices, and then compare the postal service employees' pay and the Federal employees in lower brackets pay increase with price increases.

I feel that an increase of $800 per year for postal service employees and the Federal employees in the lower brackets is a reasonable increase. I especially suggest to this committee that they should bear in mind that Uncle Sam will again step in and take $160 out of that $800, leaving an actual increase of only $640.

I am not criticizing Uncle Sam, but the old gentleman with the striped trousers and stovepipe hat never misses a bet. He takes from the needy as well as the wealthy.

In addition, may I suggest that since we have given directly or indirectly to foreign nations something like $27,000,000,000 since the war ended, and we are about to give another $17,000,000,000, it is about time that we take care of the people who are at home; people who are still proud of being Americans. Charity still should begin at home even though we have temporarily lost our better judgment.

SWEET CHARITY

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the thousands of people who do the work of our vast Government faithfully and patiently have looked to this Congress for a self-respecting increase in pay which would enable them to live in decency.

I am not speaking now for the postal employees alone as covered in this bill, and for whom I have repeatedly and publicly demanded a salary increase of at least $1,000 a year to meet the fly-away prices which resulted from the scuttling of price controls by the Republican Party.

Other Federal workers face the same inflation.

I was prepared to offer amendments to bring the salaries to a livable level, had the measure been permitted to come up under regular procedure weeks ago, when the bill was just as ready as it is now.

I hope the House failure to provide a cost-of-living increase for Federal employees—and I mean the clerks, the typists, the secretaries, the girls in my own office, the laborers, and the minor executives—will be remedied by the other House.

I hope, too, that the majority leadership can be proud of this stale half loaf of charity. I could not be, were the responsibility mine.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this bill H. R. 6916. I regret the raise is not larger, at least $800 which I supported in the committee. We must vote for this or nothing. I regret that it does not cover all Federal employees in the classified lists. I hope we may be able before we adjourn, to pass such a bill covering all employees. I urge that the raise be raised for such employees to $800 and I appeal to the leadership to present such a bill to the House for passage before we adjourn.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for H. R. 6916 but must say that it is a disgrace of this Congress to throw such a crumb to the postal work-

ers of our country. It has been proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that the postal employees and all other Federal employees really need at least $800 per year.

It has come to the point where we have to vote for a $450 raise or nothing.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a crime committed against the Government workers of America. It marks another one of the many broken promises with which the Republican Party has paved its road to hypocrisy.

First, it does not give the postal workers what they were led to believe they would receive.

Second, it completely destroys the morale of all Federal workers at a time when a raise was desperately needed.

Third, in this campaign year it refuses to raise rates on periodicals because of pressure.

Lastly, an increase in postal rates has no place in the same bill as wage increase.

I repeat, this is a crime. We are constantly driving the workers of our country to the wall. Brutalizing them with the Taft-Hartley law, terrorizing with the Mundt bill, fooling them with a phony housing act, and finally refusing to stop run-away prices and refusing to raise workers' pay.

This sop to the postal workers will not fool them or all Federal workers in November.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 6916, which among other provisions will increase salaries of postal employees. I wholeheartedly favor this particular phase of H. R. 6916.

A few months ago I testified before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in favor of an increase for these loyal Government postal employees—actually I supported a larger increase in salary than this legislation permits, but this is a step in the right direction.

I am extremely pleased to see the rules suspended and its passage expedited by the House of Representatives today. I shall vote for H. R. 6916 and continue to press for the final enactment into law of this much-deserved pay raise for postal employees.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, while I am very glad that some measure to grant well-deserved and urgently needed pay raises to postal workers has been at long last presented to this House for action, it is most distressing that its terms are not more generous. I am of course deeply pained that no general pay raise bill granting increases to other Government employees has been brought before us for action before adjournment.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. REES] whom I greatly esteem, is exceptionally able and conscientious, and his committee is comprised of some of the best men in this House. The distinguished gentleman and his committee have labored long and faithfully on pay raise legislation and I deeply regret that in the pressure of the final business of the Congress, the full program of pay increases for all Government workers has not been submitted to this House.

I cannot express enthusiasm about the principle contained in the bill of binding pay raises to rate increases in certain categories because I think that the results are inevitably to confuse the budgetary position of the Post Office Department, and also place burdens inequitably and disproportionately upon various users of the postal system.

The bill provides some measure of relief, however, and grants substantial increases, which coupled with current tax reductions and an improved retirement system, justifies me in voting for it even though I would desire a better, a more generous bill and a sounder-based, better-devised budgetary arrangement to finance it.

Personally I have worked unceasingly to assist our faithful postal workers and other worthy and loyal Government employees to secure well-merited pay raises. I appeared in their behalf before the appropriate committees of both House and Senate and have worked in many other ways to help secure favorable consideration for them.

Without question the House will pass this measure under suspension of the rules and thereby place its seal of approval upon legislation which, if in some respects inadequate, will nevertheless aid and assist, in this period of skyrocketing prices and inflation, our loyal postal workers who, like all our citizens and particularly our working people, are suffering from current high-price levels. I will vote for the bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported legislation now pending in Congress providing adequate pay raises for postal employees and other Federal employees. I filed a bill which so provided. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee has reported out H. R. 6916. This is the only legislation covering this subject upon which the House has the privilege of voting. The bill is considered under a suspension of rules which permits no amendments. The amount of pay raises cannot therefore be changed during the present consideration of the bill. I shall therefore vote for H. R. 6916, although I would have preferred a larger pay increase. The Federal employees are entitled to a raise in pay. I regret that this legislation does not grant them more than it does.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in suport of H. R. 6916 which is a bill to provide additional compensation for the postal employees. These employees have not received the raises and increases in salary that others have. They have been left far behind in their compensation. They are not receiving adequate salary to meet the high cost of living of today. I have followed closely the various bills that have been introduced and open hearings which have been held in the committees. I had hoped that the Membership of the House would be allowed to consider a much larger salary increase than is provided in this bill, as, in my opinion, the raise provided for in this bill is not adequate nor sufficient to meet present conditions.

We, of course, realize that the leadership in the House has the authority to decide which bills will be considered and which will not. They have offered the present bill as the only one for our consideration. Therefore, not permitted the privilege of supporting a bill providing for a larger increase than the present one, I wholeheartedly support the bill under consideration which, while it is inadequate to meet the high cost of living of today, will afford these employees some measure of assistance which they are entitled to and so richly deserve.

It is my understanding that the postal employees have had only two increases in salary since 1925, which increases have been negligible, whereas the cost of living has soared sky high. I hope that if a larger amount of increases cannot be given that this bill will certainly pass. I desire to say now to the Members of this body that I now stand ready to support an amendment which increases to any reasonable extent the amount allowed in this bill. But I fully realize that under the present rules under which we are proceeding no amendments are permissible. Therefore, is is vitally important to pass this bill as it is now or there will be no raise.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that all of the Federal employees are entitled to an increase in their compensation. The Federal employees' raises have in no way kept pace with the raises of other working people. Their remuneration is far behind those in like employment in non-Government work. It is my earnest desire and hope that this Congress will not adjourn until adequate provision has been made for the faithful employees of our Government. Many of them work long hours and ofttimes work overtime, for which they are not sufficiently paid. I desire at this time to lend my voice in support of the salary raise for all Federal employees, and I trust that the present leadership will see fit to allow this bill to go through, realizing that it is entirely up to the leadership of this body to say whether or not these increases will be made, as, under the rules upon which the House is proceeding from now until adjournment, only such matters as are cleared by the House leadership will be considered.

If an amendment was permitted to the pending bill whereby all Federal employees will be given raises, which I am sorry is not allowed, I would earnestly and to the best of my ability support it, and believe that the increase would be such as to be of real help to these people who so richly deserve the additional compensation.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today the Eightieth Congress passed legislation providing for a permanent increase for all post-office employees in the amount of $460 per year.

I want to state publicly that I voted in favor of passage of the bill and I also want to state that I supported this bill, and other bills, providing for even more liberal allowances in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House, of which I am a member.

I think it appropriate to state at this time that if it had not been for the activities of certain members of the committee, particularly the Democratic members, this bill would have been reported out of committee and passed the House long ago. Despite the fact that I was in favor of a retroactive increase, the activities of certain members of the

committee in emasculating the legislation which met my approval, and the approval of the chairman of the committee and some of the members on the Republican side, alienated some Members of Congress who otherwise would have voted for the bill. Under the circumstances and in view of the difficulties which we have met, I feel that this bill is just, fair, and equitable. Our postal workers are certainly deserving of an increase in salary and I hope and trust that the additional money which they receive will, to some extent, give them the additional incentive which they deserve and will add to their morale.

It is indeed unfortunate that this much-needed and beneficial legislation was not passed by the House long ago and it is equally unfortunate that the bill which was passed did not contain the retroactive feature which I hoped for; but I am pleased that I had the opportunity to vote for an increase in wages for these deserving men and women.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Republican leadership has finally consented to let the House pass upon the bill now under consideration which provides for an increase in the salaries of all postal employees. I heartily approve of this legislation and have been for a number of weeks adding my voice to the voices of other Members of the House demanding action on this bill.

I regret exceedingly, however, that there is not included in this bill a substantial salary increase for the other faithful Government employees included in all of the classifications of the Civil Service. The cost of living has increased for them just as it has for all of us. It is manifestly unfair not to grant them also a reasonable increase in their salary so that they can meet the high cost of living.

I regret too that this bill has tied to it an increase in postal rates, especially in the third- and fourth-class rates. I say this because this means an increase in the cost of those things purchased by those of our people who live in rural communities and who must depend upon parcel post for many of the articles they buy.

It seems to me that if an increase in the postal rates were to be made they should have been made in a separate bill after careful consideration of all of the issues involved. Moreover, I can see no reason why third- or fourth-class mail rates should be raised when no raise in rates for second-class matter is provided. This seems especially strange in view of the fact that the main portion of the deficit from the operation of the Post Office Department comes from the second-class-mail matter.

It is my sincere wish, and, I trust, not a forlorn hope, that a bill raising the salary of our Civil Service employees will be passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I appeared before both the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and advocated a flat and permanent increase of $1,000 for our postal employees. I felt that such an increase was not only justified by reason of the present increased cost of living but also because the general standard of living has been so elevated that it is unthinkable not to enable our loyal postal workers to retain that higher standard.

I was deeply disappointed when I heard that the committee had in the first instance approved a raise of only $585. To my mind that was bad enough but when the bill started to get a tossing around, so that no one knew whether it would ever reach the floor, even $585 became acceptable. But $585 was not to be had for postal employees either, for this bill, H. R. 6916, now comes before us with an increase of only $450.

I appreciate the time spent and effort devoted by the chairman of his committee on this subject, and I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] placing the blame for this reduced amount squarely where it belongs. I am truly sorry for the postal employees who are receiving such shabby treatment but I trust that we may hold out hope for a future increase when a new Congress is elected.

Although I feel that $450 is inadequate I shall support the bill for the reason that no amendment being possible under our present procedure, it is $450 or nothing.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, a wage increase for people holding civil-service positions is long overdue. I am glad this bill to provide more nearly adequate compensation for postal employees has finally been brought up. It deserves the support of every Member of this House.

However, it is regretted that we are not permitted to vote also for increased compensation to other civil servants who also find it virtually impossible to make ends meet. We should no longer delay action which is so sorely needed.

Let me urge every Member of the House to support this measure. In justice to our postal employees we must.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending bill. H. R. 6916, the postal employees salary increase bill may not provide all the salary increase which our postal employees deserve but the increase provided is far better than no salary increase legislation at all during this session. The $450 annual increase for postal employees in the field service is justly deserved. Likewise, the 25 cents per hour increase for hourly paid postal employees and the increase of 25 percent for our fourth-class postmasters is equally meritorious. There are no more loyal, faithful, and efficient employees in our Government service than our postal employees and I am pleased to support this legislation providing the increases for them enumerated. The present day high cost of living, coupled with the faithful and loyal service of our postal employees, makes the passage of this bill highly desirable. I urge support of this salary increase legislation for employees in the Postal Department.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. I do so not because I think it entirely satisfactory, but because it is the only bill presented to us on the question, and I believe the postal workers had rather have this bill than no bill at all. This bill is presented to us under a move to suspend the rules which does not permit any amendment being offered. We must vote the bill up or down as it is written.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill some months ago on the subject of salary raises for postal workers and my bill provided for a raise of $800. I have pushed that bill diligently. The bill presented to us today provides for $450. I do not think that is enough, but this is the bill which the Republican leadership has agreed on and presented to us, and we are presented with the choice of taking it or leaving it. Naturally I am voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the House leadership has not presented us a bill to also give some increase to other Federal workers. I note from newspaper reports that there is some hope that when this bill gets over to the Senate, an amendment will be offered to include other Federal workers. I hope this is so. It should be done.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, while this bill is not in the sum I would like, and while it is not entirely satisfactory in other respects, I am glad the House leadership has at last decided to let us vote on even this bill. The prospects for this legislation have been rather gloomy at times, and I am glad that the bill was finally presented. I hope it passes unanimously.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we in this House acknowledge the obligation which we owe to the faithful public servants in the Post Office Department. I think it is high time, Mr. Speaker, that we adopt this bill in order to provide them with increased compensation.

Mr. Speaker, these people are working for us. These people serve at our will, and because their pay is determined by us, we should no longer dodge the issue. I suppose this group of Federal employees is the largest group of workers within the country which is denied the right to strike for increased wages and better working conditions. They are entirely at our mercy. Not only is it just that we pass this resolution to increase their small incomes in this day of rising costs of living, but it is our public duty to do so before this session ends.

I regret that the Republican policy committee has not seen fit to include all Federal employees in this bill. It is no more right that postal workers receive this increase than it is that all other Federal workers be given increased compensation. I hope that when this bill goes to conference, if it does, that we in the House are given an opportunity to do the right thing, the just thing, the fair thing, and pay our Government workers salaries commensurate with the high cost of living.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of this committee, I personally was in favor of an $800 permanent increase for all postal workers including postmasters, postal workers, and so forth. I was also in favor of another bill for a pay increase for all Federal employees in the amount of $600.

This committee reported out a bill for an increase of $585 for postal employees, and a bill for a $450 increase for all Federal employees. There was not a dissenting vote, and both Democratic and Republican members of this committee voted unanimously for these two bills in

those amounts. They were arrived at through a compromise in the committee.

It is very apparent that it will be impossible to secure an increase of more than $450, as is provided for in this bill now before the House. Notwithstanding the fact that I favor an increase of $800, I am going to vote for this increase for postal workers for $450 on the theory that when it is impossible to get a whole loaf of bread a half loaf is better than none at all.

I am appealing to the leadership here in the House at this time to bring up the bill providing for a pay increase for all Federal employees of $360. While it is true that I was in favor of a $600 increase, I am going to vote for the $360 increase on the same theory that a half a loaf is better than nothing at all.

I personally want to take this opportunity to commend the various witnesses who appeared before the committee on this legislation, and to thank them for their excellent work and cooperation in this pay-increase legislation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I feel it only my duty to urge my colleagues' approval of this legislation. I have, as most of you know, repeatedly appeared before the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees to request their favorable action on the various bills providing for a substantial compensation increase to our postal and Federal employees. With particular reference to the postal employees, I submit that this faithful corps of public servants, by their industry and devotion to their work, deserve the gratitude, respect, and admiration of all our people.

The continued newspaper articles and editorials, urging compensation increases for them, is clear and convincing evidence of the practically universal recognition of their salary adjustment needs. They are compelled to pay for their own uniforms, where required, and their 1945 increase has been nullified by our ever-rising living cost.

It is not necessary for me to take your valuable time, at this hour, in recitation of the changing economic conditions which have cut down materially the size of the purchasing dollar in the hands of the wage earners of America; indeed, the committee hearings clearly reveal the existence of economic factors which seriously handicap our postal employees in their struggle to maintain a decent way of life for themselves and their family. There is pressing and urgent need for pay adjustment, to raise the living standards of our postal employees to a more equitable level, and I earnestly exhort you to pass this bill without delay. I regret exceedingly that the provisions debated here prevent the opportunity for considering and approving a more substantial increase.

I would consider myself remiss in my obligation if I did not, at this moment, urge the Members of the Rules Committee to allow us to act upon a wage increase bill, for all our Government workers, before adjournment.

A comparative study of the revised wage scales in private industry with the compensation levels of our Federal employees will emphasize the inequities currently existing. If this Government is to uphold the tradition of efficient service administered by capable personnel, it must offer the employees wages comparable to other occupations of the same nature. The best guarantee against a turbulent America in these critical times, is the extension of a fair living wage to all our workers both inside and outside of Government employ. Our Government workers, who cannot bargain collectively for increased compensation, or strike, must be provided for by congressional action. I again sincerely request the Rules Committee to enable us to consider and approve a bill for a substantial increase to all our Government employees to permit them to meet their personal and family obligations with confidence and a high morale.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this Congress has before it many pressing problems demanding attention, but, in my opinion, and I am confident that this opinion is favored by the majority of my colleagues, none of them are more deserving of our speedy consideration than that of approving a substantial and permanent salary increase for all our faithful and efficient Federal employees.

SALARY INCREASES FOR ALL FEDERAL WORKERS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to declare my support of this measure which provides a $450 pay raise for the employees of the United States Post Office Department. These workers are certainly deserving of such salary increases, and I am happy to see this legislation finally come to the floor. This measure should have been debated and passed long ago, and would have, had it not been for the obstructionist tactics of the enemy bloc who have stalled on this issue for many months.

The fact that I am going to vote for this bill, however, does not blind me to its deficiencies. For it is my opinion that an increase of $450 is little more than a token increase, and one that is wholly inadequate to affect the ever-increasing cost of living The following facts will support this position. Under prewar legislation establishing salary schedules for postal employees, the average median salary in 1941 was only $1,902. During the war, the salaries of postal employees were raised about $800—a 40-percent adjustment. The effect of this wartime pay raise brought the average salary for postal workers to about $2,700.

Although this increase appears substantial, it is wholly inadequate for several reasons. In the first place, the cost of living has risen about 60 percent during this period when salaries were increasing by only 40 percent, the effect of which has been a reduction in the real wages of the workers, and a general lowering of their living standards. In the second place, the postal workers' salaries have not kept pace with the wages of industry. During this war period, when postal workers were receiving 40-percent pay raises, the wages in durable-goods industries were increased by 61 percent.

Thus it becomes obvious that a 20-percent salary increase over the average postal salary of $2,700 is necessary for postal workers to maintain their living standards in the face of rising living costs. It is likewise necessary to bring these workers' wages into harmony with industrial wage levels established during the war. Such a 20-percent increase amounts to $540, which is $90 above that which is provided by this bill.

But even this amount is not enough. I wish to remind the House that the industrial wage pattern is changing today, and the automobile workers, for example, are now obtaining another 10 percent pay raise. Using this as a standard, the postal workers deserve an additional $270, bringing the total increase to $810 per year. In other words, it would take this amount to give the postal workers the same take-home pay as they enjoyed in 1941, and to fit the Government's wage policy into the emerging pattern of industrial wage levels.

I also want to go on record as saying that I have favored a $1,000 pay increase for all Federal workers—both postal and classified—for some time, and that I introduced the $1,000 pay raise bill—H. R. 5526—in the House—the same bill which the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] introduced in the other body. I am still convinced that the thousand-dollar pay-raise objective is desirable and equitable, and that it would go far to maintain the efficiency and morale of the Federal service. Although I am supporting this bill, it is my hope that the other House will increase the amount, and amend its coverage to embrace all Federal workers.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year I introduced legislation to increase the salaries of both postal employees and Federal employees generally. These measures called for increases of $800 per employee to offset increased living costs. I shall support the pending bill but must express my keen regret that all Federal employees are not included. To provide increases for one group and not for another is an obvious discrimination. I sincerely hope that the Senate can provide a remedy and extend the salary increase to all Federal employees. All of them deserve this benefit.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see legislation finally come to the floor of the House to provide a long-delayed and much-needed salary increase for postal workers. On April 21, nearly 2 months ago, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported out H. R. 5667, which provided a raise of $585 per year for postal employees. This bill also was retroactive by its terms to April 1, 1948.

I have on several occasions, since that bill was reported out by our committee, urged that the House take action to provide this salary increase.

After much uncertainty and apprehension regarding the fate of that bill, we are today taking final action in the House for salary increases to this group of Federal employees. I am glad that this bill by its terms will be permanent, rather than temporary. I regret that it does not provide a figure which will more adequately take care of the increased cost of living.

I introduced on December 17, 1947, H. R. 4772, which, if enacted, would provide a salary increase of $600 per annum

for postal employees. At the time I introduced that bill, based upon a report furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it was my opinion that $600 would take care of the increase in the cost of living. I am disappointed that the raise provided in the bill now under consideration is $150 lower than the figure called for in my bill.

Under all the circumstances, inasmuch as it is a question of supporting this bill or nothing at all, I shall vote for it.

I take this occasion to say, however, that other Federal employees are also entitled to a salary increase to meet the present high cost of living, which they are experiencing just the same as postal employees.

I earnestly urge that legislation to provide such an increase for the other Federal employees be enacted either today or tomorrow, before this present session of Congress ends.

In my opinion the postal-rate increases provided in title II of this bill now under consideration should not be considered along with and as a part of the bill providing a raise for postal employees. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee held extensive hearings regarding postal-rate increases. I am opposed to the increase in air-mail postage, and I am opposed to certain of the parcel-post and third-class mail rate increases. I voted against these rate increases when the postal rate bill was before the committee, and I would vote against these rate increases now if they were being considered on their own merits. They have been attached to this postal employees salary increase bill, and inasmuch as the two items cannot be separated under present procedure, I am voting for the bill as a whole. It is my earnest hope the conference committee may see fit to eliminate that part of the bill which relates to postage rates if this legislation goes to a conference committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported a permanent increase of $800 for all postal workers. I regret that this was not the amount of the increase in the bill we have just passed. However, the $450 raise will help some. I was surprised to learn that this increase is the largest single one ever passed by any Congress for our postal workers.

It is the purpose of this legislation to provide a permanent increase in the salaries of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department and to offset a portion of the increased cost by an increase in postal rates.

Title I of the bill provides an annual increase of $450 in the salaries of postal employees in the field service of the Post Office Department who are paid on an annual basis. Increases are provided in the amount of 25 cents per hour for hourly employees and increase of 25 percent for fourth-class postmasters.

Based upon figures submitted by the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget, the total cost of title I of the bill will be approximately $211,221,797. All of the 479,850 employees in the field service of the Post Office Department will receive pay increases under the provisions of the bill.

The committee devoted much study to this legislation and the hearings lasted from February 25 to March 17, 1948. Testimony presented by the postal employees' national organizations stressed the necessity for an increase in the salaries of postal employees because of the increased cost of living since July 1946. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the present cost-of-living index is 167.5 as compared with the index of 100 in 1939.

To offset part of the rising cost of living, according to the testimony, postal employees in the field service have been granted two substantial permanent pay raises. The first was by adjustments in salaries and classifications under Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, amounting to $400 for each postal employee, beginning July 1, 1945. The second was under Public Law 386, Seventy-ninth Congress, which granted an additional permanent salary increase of $400 a year for the postal employees, effective January 1, 1946.

On the basis of the foregoing, the committee believed that a pay raise of $450 per annum would be ample additional compensation to meet the rising cost of living.

Representatives of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget presented the views of their agencies to the committee. In general, these witnesses stated that in view of the President's budget message which did not include provision for increasing the salaries of Federal employees, they could not at this time recommend additional compensation in the salaries of the employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, from the above it is obvious that a Republican Congress has gone down the line for pay increases to this group of loyal and patriotic Federal workers even though the Post Office Department and the President were opposed to the raise. I applaud this action as meritorious and deserving, notwithstanding this official opposition.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say that I shall support and vote for H. R. 6916 with pleasure and confidence. This is the largest single raise that has ever been granted to the postal employees, and a well merited one. They receive this increase, and they have also received a substantial reduction in income taxes. This entire committee has labored ever since I have been in the Congress to bring forth some such legislation, and I think that we have good reason to be proud of it. I know that the postal employees are glad to have a permanent raise.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I will only have time in the 2 minutes allotted me to make a few brief observations on this bill. First of all I want it understood that I am in favor of an $800 permanent increase for both postal employees and other Federal employees. I also feel that the wages of wage board employees should be increased proportionately. Secondly, I want to point out that I am going to vote for this bill because I have no alternative. It is better that we give our deserving postal employees a few crumbs than to give them no legislation at all. Thirdly, however, I want to state that neither the postal pay legislation nor the postal rate legislation included in this bill is the legislation originally reported out by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

More than a year ago that committee reported out legislation recommending postal rate increases. I personally did not favor that legislation because I look upon the Post Office Department, as I look upon all departments of the Government, as an agency to serve the public and not as a money-making institution. Much less, however, do I favor the manner in which postal rate increases have been added to this bill.

In this bill we are not increasing the rates of these users of the mail responsible for the largest portion of the present deficit in the Post Office Department. On the contrary, the Republican policy committee has chosen to pick on those of least political influence. They have done this unfairly, because they have added to the postal-pay legislation postal-rate-increase legislation, making it difficult for those affected by such rate increases to come in and protest, since they recognize as over 200 Members of this House, testifying before our committee, recognized that there is a dire need for a pay increase for our postal and other Federal employees. It is unfair to tie up a part of our postal rate legislation with a part of our salary increase legislation and bring it back to the committee with the ultimatum that we take this or get nothing. I insist that both the postal-pay legislation and the legislation designed to increase postal rates should have come before the House on their own respective merits.

Lastly, it has been said that neither the President of the United States nor the Bureau of the Budget has recommended this legislation. May I call the attention of the House to the fact, however, that when the President said he did not favor increases in salary legislation, he hinged that statement specifically upon his recommendation that the Congress had to do something to control the spiral of inflation. The President was thinking in terms of the purchasing power of the money received by our Federal employees.

I am quite sure that since the Congress has failed to do anything about the rising cost of living, the President, as does every Member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, recognizes the need for salary increases for our postal and other Government employees. I have no doubt under these circumstances but that he will give his approval to legislation providing for such increases.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this legislation even though it does not give sufficient relief to our postal employees. It is my understanding that we will not, during this session, have an opportunity to vote for an increase in compensation to Government employees, nor will we have an opportunity to vote for the larger amount in increase for postal employees. This I regret but I shall certainly vote that the postal employees receive something, rather than nothing at all for their faithfulness.

I want to quote from a telegram just received from one of the local federation of post office clerks in my district as follows:

Efficient postal service most important during peace or war, under Democrats or Republicans, whether rain or shine.

Gentlemen, none of us would deny that the above is true, for our postal employees have been faithful at all times and rendered efficient postal service.

I appeared before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service months ago and urged that the increase in compensation legislation be reported favorably to the House in order that this body might have an opportunity to stand up and vote thereon.

None of us can deny that living costs have increased. I have been advised that many of our faithful and efficient postal workers must retire from Government service and seek employment with private industry in an endeavor to support their families, if they are not allowed an increase. In many instances the wife and mother has had to seek outside employment in an endeavor to supplement a salary paid her husband as a faithful employee, in order that the family might have, not the luxuries of life, but the necessities.

An increase of $800 would be more in keeping with the increase in living conditions and this amount is what I had hoped to have an opportunity to support.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise rather reluctantly to support this bill. I say reluctantly because I feel that it is entirely inadequate. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held extensive hearings, and with only one dissenting vote passed out a bill authorizing $585 a year increase in salaries for faithful postal workers. They passed out a second bill recommending $468 a year for classified workers in the Federal service. These measures are well merited. We had extensive testimony showing the cost of living and its impact upon faithful public workers. It was definitely shown to us that these people had to supplement their earnings with outside employment, and I submit that is not in the best interests of the Government, or they had to have their wives work.

What happened? These bills were reported from the committee about 2 months ago. They have reposed in the Committee on Rules since that time. They came out of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with only one dissenting vote. They represent a compromise, because many of us felt that $585 was inadequate. They came out with one dissenting vote, a compromise between the majority and minority members of the committee. I submit that is the factual finding of the committee. Then what happened? Two days ago we were given this bill and told that we would have to take $450 or nothing. I cannot vote against the bill because I know the plight of these workers. I know the condition in which they find themselves. So I am constrained to take it. That is why I say to you I very reluctantly recommend the passage of the bill. The faithful public workers of this country asked for bread, and the Republican policy committee handed them a stone—a stone, if you please, covered with the slime of partisan politics.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. HEDRICK. Does not the gentleman believe that with the high cost of living, these postal employees should have at least an $800 raise at this time?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am happy to concur in the thought expressed by my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK. They should have an $800 increase.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. REES. Of course, we were in the unfortunate, or whatever position you would like to call it, of getting no help from the Bureau of the Budget on this problem. The Post Office Department, as the gentleman knows, did not recommend any of this increase.

Mr. MILLER of California. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, but the Democratic Members of your committee without exception support this raise.

Mr. REES. I understand that.

Mr. MILLER of California. We stand on the record that we support the raise and we now want the raise. We are not going to let you and the Republican policy committee hide behind the President's skirts. You could have followed him, sir, on the matter of retaining controls to hold down the high cost of living. To stop inflation. You could have done that.

Mr. REES. Of course, if you are talking about the OPA, that is something else.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. May I say that all members of our committee worked in harmony, Republicans as well as Democrats, and have done a splendid job, including the distinguished chairman.

When the President's Budget Bureau suggested no Federal pay raise, he requested private industry to make no raises. That all had to do with the problem of inflation. Private industry now has had to raise wages because of the continued raise in living costs.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his pertinent observation.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] for having the courage and showing their interest in getting a pay raise for the postal workers by bringing to the floor of the House permanent legislation providing for a $450 a year increase for them in the face of the opposition of the President, the Budget Bureau, and of this administration, which is now in power in the executive branch. I want to congratulate them. Secondly, I want to say to those Democratic Members who have made a political issue out of this in the debate, that you are fooling no one, and certainly not the officials of the postal organization employees. It is well known that the men in high union positions representing all the workers, are much more pleased with this $450 a year permanent increase than if they had the bill you Members have been talking about providing for $585 temporary increases. Any of them will tell you that, and doubtless most of them have told you Members who are trying to make a political issue out of this, that they are extremely pleased with this bill and would rather have the $450 permanent increase than a $585 a year temporary increase. Why try to deceive the postal workers in your district by the statements you have made in this debate?

Third, let me suggest to you people that you are following the line that you followed on every bill to spend money since I have been in Congress. If you were not so thoroughly imbued with the idea of tremendous appropriations for flood controls along the Brazos River in the State of Texas—the State from which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] hails—and for flood control, and every other expense, and for the spending of billions and billions of dollars, much of it wasted, we would have more money to give to the postal workers.

From the well of this House I said to you people who were so insistent that we have $6,800,000,000 for the first year of the ERP to give to Europe that the postal workers were coming along; that we better save something for them and for Federal aid to education. Yet, you put into the bill every billion and every million possible. Your record has been to increase every appropriation. Your record has been one of such waste and spending that it is a wonder we have any money left to give any raise in wages for the splendid and deserving postal employees of this country.

Let me repeat, were it not for the fight for economy that the Republican Party has made for the past 5 or 6 years, and particularly the last 2 years, you would not have any money with which to raise the pay of these Federal employees.

This Republican Congress in this session has to its credit the enactment of the most liberal employees' retirement bill for all Federal employees in the history of this Government. It means almost countless millions in benefits to them now and in the future. This Congress has passed dozens of bills, all beneficial to postal and Federal employees, and most every one was reported out of our committee.

Let the undisputed record show that during this and the prior session of the Eightieth Congress that more and better legislation has been passed in the interest of postal employees than was ever before passed by any Congress since the beginning of this Republic. No one can dispute this fact.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have supported the pay raise for the hard-working postal workers whose living standards are so seriously jeopardized by the high cost of living, and I am very gratified that the House today will perform at least some part of this act of justice. I advocated a $1,000-per-year pay raise before the House Committee on Civil Service and Post Office and believe that this was needed. The House today is making a start in recognizing that because a man works for his Government does not mean that he is not worthy of his hire. On the contrary the Government should be the first to recognize the need for adjusting wage scales to costs of living because individual initiative of the employee in asking for a raise is so much more difficult with the Government. I hope that the next session Congress will again examine this question with a view toward seeing that its action is adequate to the need

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 6916.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, for keeping his pledge to bring legislation before the House providing salary increases for postal employees and other Federal workers.

The House has just passed by unanimous vote the bill granting a permanent increase of $450 per annum for postmasters and postal employees. I do hope before the Congress adjourns we will pass a similar bill which is pending providing for a temporary increase of $360 per annum for other Federal workers.

Along with a number of my colleagues, I introduced last December bills which would provide an increase of $800 for workers in both of these categories. I believed then—and I still believe—that an increase in this amount would be fair and equitable and necessary in order to bring their income in line with the increased cost of living. It is regrettable that it has been determined that conditions will not permit at this time an increase larger than that which has been approved for postal workers and that which has been proposed for Federal workers.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly urge and sincerely hope that during the congressional recess the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will make a thorough study of the relation of the pay schedules of postal and other Federal employees to the rise in the cost of living since 1940, so that the Congress when it returns next January may provide for additional compensation for loyal and deserving Government workers. I shall strongly support a further increase.

FEDERAL ALCOHOL ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5849) to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, and for other purposes, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

There was no objection.

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE—WILSON AGAINST GRANGER

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged resolution (H. Res. 692) relative to the contested election case of Wilson against Granger, First Congressional District of Utah, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include some newspaper articles and other extraneous matter.

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

AIR PARCEL POST

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6773) to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the rate of postage on mailable matter exceeding 8 ounces in weight, but not weighing more than 70 pounds nor measuring more than 100 inches in length and girth combined, when carried by air and including other transportation to and from air-mail routes, shall, except as otherwise herein provided, be determined on the basis of the eight postal zones established for fourth-class matter, as follows:

(1) For delivery within the first or second zones, 55 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(2) For delivery within the third zone, 60 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 8 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(3) For delivery within the fourth zone, 65 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 14 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(4) For delivery within the fifth zone, 70 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 24 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(5) For delivery within the sixth zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 33 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(6) For delivery within the seventh zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 45 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(7) For delivery within the eighth zone, which, with respect to air parcel post, shall include all offices located in continental United States beyond the seventh zone, 80 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof over 8 ounces, plus 65 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(8) For air parcels exchanged between offices in continental United States and offices in Territories and possessions of the United States in either direction, and between offices within such Territories and possessions, the applicable zone rate shown in paragraphs (1) to (6) of this section shall apply to and including the seventh zone: *Provided*, That for offices falling in the eighth zone the rate of postage for air parcels weighing in excess of 8 ounces shall be 80 cents for each pound or fraction thereof.

(9) Mailable matter of light weight in relation to size shall be subject to such surcharge as may be determined by the Postmaster General to be warranted by reason of the extra space and care required in handling and transporting such mail matter.

(10) The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 973), as amended, or any order, rule, or regulation made by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder, as may be necessary for the safe and expeditious transportation by air of mail matter weighing in excess of 8 ounces.

(11) The Postmaster General is further authorized and directed for the period of 2 years, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) to (9), inclusive, of this section, to adjust from time to time the weight limit, size, rate of postage, zone or zones or conditions, or either, in order to promote the service to the public and assure the receipt of revenue from such service adequate to pay the cost thereof.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized, in the disbursement of the appropriation for domestic air-mail service, to apply a part thereof to the purpose of leasing suitable quarters at public airports for use in the handling and distribution of air mail at a reasonable rental to be paid quarterly or monthly, for a term not exceeding 20 years.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 730, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session), entitled "An act to fix the rate of postage on domestic air mail, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The rate of postage on domestic air mail weighing 8 ounces or less shall be 5 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That the rate of postage on air mail of the first class weighing in excess of 8 ounces

shall be the rate provided for air parcels but in no case shall be less than 3 cents an ounce or fraction thereof."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the third month following the month of enactment.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, the gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee for 20 minutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it establishes initial rates for the carrying of parcels exceeding eight ounces and not exceeding 70 pounds by air. These rates are set up in accordance with the regular eight parcel post zones, and the committee has been assured by the Post Office Department that the rates provided will return to the Department sufficient revenue to pay the expenditures of this new service. Not only will this provide a fine new service to the people of the United States but will as well, utilize more than 20,000,000 ton-miles of space for which we are now paying but which the Post Office Department does not have sufficient volume of mail to use.

This unused space is a result of the practice of the Civil Aeronautics Board in establishing rates to the Post Office Department for carrying air mail based upon plane-mile and minimum-load factors. Under the plane-mile rate which applies generally to the feeder lines, the Post Office Department pays a fixed fee covering every mile a plane of a specific line travels. The air line is required to carry all of the mail presented for carriage by the Post Office Department. Because of the low volume of first-class air mail on feeder line runs, only a small portion of this space is used.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to the floor with the recommendation of the membership of our committee. I know of no objection to it. On two occasions it was objected to on the Consent Calendar, but I am informed by both these gentlemen that now they have no objection and will support this legislation.

If any of you have questions to ask as I proceed I shall be glad to try to answer them. In that way we may expedite consideration of this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 6773, will provide for an air parcel-post service.

The minimum load factor rate applies to the smaller trunk lines. Under this rate the Post Office Department is required to pay at a specific ton-mile rate for a minimum amount of mail whether that mail is carried or not. On a more limited scale this has the same effect as the plane-mile rate and a large volume of space is paid for by the Post Office Department because there is not sufficient mail available to fill this space. This plane-mile and minimum-load factor is where a large part of the subsidy paid to the air lines is hidden.

This procedure permits the ton-mile rates to these respective carriers to be comparable. At the same time by raising the minimum-load factor, different air lines are paid considerably out of proportion to the service performed. I would like to make it crystal clear that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee does not agree with this manner of establishing rates. We have submitted a report, House Report No. 1958, in which it is recommended that the subsidy be separated from the air-mail pay and the Post Office Department be required to pay only for the service performed. However, since it is not within the jurisdiction of our committee to present legislation on this particular phase of our aviation policy, we are forced in establishing our air-mail rates and our air-mail programs to take into consideration the conditions which have grown up under the Civil Aeronautics Board.

It is expedient under the present rates to establish this air parcel-post system and to do it at once—because of the large amount of space which is not being used by the Department for which it must pay, plus the fact that on May 8, 1948, the larger air lines were granted an increase amounting to $5,000,000 annually. Under the new schedule of increases these carriers will receive a reduced ton-mile rate if the volume is increased. It is more advantageous and economical at the present time to establish the carriage of this mail in the manner already provided for regular air mail.

There is a great demand on the part of the public for this service. Coast-to-coast delivery of parcels will be advanced by 2 days. Delivery of parcels on shorter hauls will be advanced proportionately when sent by air. It is estimated that more than 50,000,000 parcels will be sent by air mail annually in order to take advantage of the advance date of delivery. A large portion of these parcels will come from new business which will be developed as a result of this time-saving transportation. Medicines, critically needed by communities, will be sent in this manner. Business experts have told us that this new service will be used for the shipment of packaged flowers, style merchandise, newspapers, and all manner of perishable products. This service will also be used for replacement parts for farm machinery. In many instances this will eliminate delays of 1 or 2 days when these parts cannot be obtained locally and may mean the saving of crops of vitally needed foodstuffs.

In summary, favorable action on this legislation will provide the American public with a desired service and will, at the same time, result in a net saving to the Post Office Department of approximately $10,000,000 annually.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to thank my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] for yielding me 3 minutes. I shall try not to use the full 3 minutes. I have asked for this time for the purpose of telling the House that on January 8, 1945, when I was a member of the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, I introduced the first air parcel-post bill. At that time I put quite an extensive amount of material in the RECORD substantiating the policy of inaugurating an air parcel-post service. This, of course, is a different manner of handling packages from the railway-air express as now handled by the air lines.

Air parcel post will provide a great deal of convenience to many people who have access to post offices but do not have access to railway express offices.

My bill was introduced in the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, January 8, 1945. At that time we were engaged in war and the Post Office Department after consideration of the bill expressed itself as being in accord with the principles of the bill, but in a letter addressed to me they said that during the war the burden of mail on the planes then available was too great to put an additional load on them.

The rates provided for air parcel post in this bill may be a little high. However, the important thing is to establish the principle of air parcel post as a part of our great post-office service. After a year's experience in the new field, a factual record of receipts and expenses will be available. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee can then review the rates and adjust them for the benefit of the public and the United States Post Office Department.

The original bill for air parcel post, H. R. 1173, which I introduced, contained a similar schedule of rates. They were purposely made a little high to prevent a deficit to the Post Office during the first trial year.

At the time I introduced the original bill the Post Office Department asked that my bill be considered after the war-time period was over. I am glad the committee has considered the matter and I am glad to see the bill on the floor at this time.

In addition to the mail privileges which it will give to a lot of American people, it will result also in the employment of a great many additional people in the airplane industry. One of the things that our air lines need at the present time is a stable freight income. This will help, I am sure, and I compliment the committee on bringing this bill forward.

I thank the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] for this time and I hope the bill passes without any objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. R. 6773, not because I oppose the principle of parcel post being carried by air but because of the way this bill has been drawn. It is one of the greatest grabs from the American taxpayer that has ever occurred in the history of our country.

The fact is that parcel post under this bill will be carried according to the air-mail letter rates instead of being carried according to the cargo rates. Here is

the difference: According to the air-mail rates the Government pays 65 cents per ton-mile. According to the air-cargo rates it is 13 cents per ton-mile. The fact remains that due to the fact these big five airline companies have complained that they are suffering a deficit, the Federal Government has agreed to give them this tremendous increase to 65 cents per ton-mile. At the same time these airlines are able to carry cargo at 13 cents per ton-mile. If any one in the House can tell me why there should be the tremendous difference between carrying cargo per ton-mile and carrying air mail per ton-mile I would like to hear them.

Under this bill parcel post could very well fit into air cargo and should be carried, therefore, for around 14 or 15 cents per ton-mile instead of 65 cents that they are going to get.

My other objection to the bill is this: As you know, since the war has ended certain veterans coming back from the war have founded airlines. Not one of them has been given a certificate by the CAB; therefore, none of them are able to operate on a regular schedule. None of them can carry air mail, none of them are eligible under this bill to carry parcel post, only the big five air lines, United, American, TWA, Northwestern, and Eastern. All of the lines started by the veterans will be obliged to carry cargo only.

Mr. Speaker, I had two amendments which I proposed that would remedy this bill. The first one is as follows:

SEC. 4. This bill shall be construed to include the services of the noncertificated air-cargo carriers holding letters of registration from the Civil Aeronautics Board for regular service and air-cargo carriers certificated for the transportation of property.

With that amendment, those veterans' lines would be included under this bill.

The other amendment I would have offered reads:

SEC. 5. The cargo carriers referred to in section 4 shall be compensated for the carriage of air parcel post at rates not to exceed by more than 5 cents a ton-mile the minimum air-freight rates prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, this difference to compensate the carrier for the priority to be accorded by it to air parcel post.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that these veterans' air lines are willing to carry this parcel post for 20 cents; yet the big-five air lines are to be given 65 cents. In other words, it is going to cost more to carry this air parcel post by the big-five lines than by the veterans' air lines, and for this reason the bill should be voted down.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to controvert the statements of the distinguished gentlemen from New York and Massachusetts. However, I think it is very needful to bring out some truth. As a matter of fact, when it comes to veterans operating air lines, there are thousands of veterans employed in the scheduled air lines, and there are others who are employed in nonscheduled air lines generally financed by persons other than themselves. It is a matter of employment more than anything else.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that statement is not correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. I deny that. That statement is absolutely correct. The gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am sorry, but I do. I have the whole list here.

Mr. HINSHAW. I know who finances those companies; some of the oil interests and some by other interests.

Mr. KENNEDY. Take Mr. Slick.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Slick is in a different position. I will take it back as far as he is concerned. But there are plenty of others who are so financed.

So far as the carriage of air parcel post is concerned, it is necessary for the Government to deal with the air lines on the basis of a minimum amount of mail to be carried, and space rates turn out to be pound rates. About 60 percent of the available capacity is now being used. It would be a great saving to the Post Office Department over-all to fill up the available space with parcel post. For that reason air parcel post would be a very fine thing. In addition, we are having great difficulty at the present time in keeping our scheduled air lines going, and they are very necessary to the welfare of the people and the national defense. Under another bill, H. R. 6501, we are making special provision for cargo carrier aircraft, to assist in the development of air cargo. The Post Office Department does not want to put this mail in the hands of the nonscheduled carriers because they must actually schedule the transport of mail. Whether it be first-class mail or other kinds of mail, they must know when the planes are to load and when they are due to arrive, so that they can be met. This nonschedule business of carrying mail, whether it is parcel post or not, is practically impossible for the Post Office Department to arrange for.

While I have deep sympathy, as these gentlemen have, for the veterans, and I know that thousands of them are employed in all of the air lines, both scheduled and nonscheduled, I trust that the House will approve of this measure as it is. It is a good measure and should be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, since I will not be with you in the House in the next Congress, I wish to take a few minutes to express my deep gratitude to my colleagues for your friendship and for the constant spirit of cooperation and fair play you have always shown me during these 9 years I have been privileged to serve in the distinguished body.

While many times we have had our differences on issues, we have always respected and given honest consideration to one another's viewpoint. The work here in the House has been pleasant and inspiring to me; our decisions have been made and our tasks accomplished under the cold light of public scrutiny. This is the most remarkable body of people in the world. Think of it—435 patriotic people from every section of our country meeting to chart a legislative program for our Nation. Every viewpoint and every interest is considered. The end result is a policy and program made by the people through their own Representatives.

During the time I have been here I have served with more than 1,200 Members. I have never had reason to doubt the honesty, good will, or patriotism of any Member—and while we all have honest differences of opinion, I do not believe any Member has ever questioned my loyalty to our country.

The friendships one makes with people from all parts of our country is a great treasure for one serving in this body and I will always remember and cherish my association with you. In spite of the criticism hurled at Congress, I think there is no harder working, more intelligent, or patriotic group of people in the country.

The press endeavors to be fair in reporting our work here in Congress. A free Congress and a free press are the greatest bulwarks of our freedom. I regret though that too frequently the sensational things which occur in Congress make the news, rather than the tedious but most important labor of Members. Some newspapers ferret out this unsensational but necessary effort in making their appraisal of Members. I hope more of them will do so in the future.

Today we are in a critical period of our history. Beset with difficult domestic problems and faced with the fact of world leadership, we have rough and perplexing days ahead. But I know we are going to come through. I have great confidence in this Congress being able to steer the Ship of State through the troubled seas. This body is going to continue to protect the rights of the people. It is going to remain spiritually and materially strong. It is going to carry on a program that will give no ground for the growth of communism or fascism or any kind of ism in our country. Also I have full confidence that the Members of Congress by prayerful patience, sturdy strength, and consistent cooperation with other free peoples will win this struggle with Communist aggression, and will show the way to peace, stability, and order to the end that the world may be saved from a devastation too horrible to contemplate.

In leaving I want you to know that my prayers will always be for you—God bless you—and our great America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, my service with my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and my association with him and his family, the charming Mrs. Kefauver, the two lovely little daughters and the one handsome son, have been sources of genuine pleasure and personal friendship. The recognition which has been given to the pa-

triotic and courageous service of my colleague stimulates pride in the hearts of his friends and, along with the many personal joys during his service with us, will, I am sure, occasion many pleasant memories and recollections for him as it will for me and his other friends in the United States House of Representatives.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Tennessee has made an outstanding record in the House, and the people of his district can well be proud of his service not only to them but to the people of his State and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that other Members desiring to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the services of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] may do so at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is leaving the House of Representatives. He has been a man of stature and a leader among us. The many valuable contributions he has made in helping to carry on the work of Congress will long be remembered. He leaves with my sincerest wishes for a bright and successful future.

I have just read an advertisement by Mr. Ed Crump, of Memphis, which unjustly defames my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

As a member of the Un-American Activities Committee and one of its former chairmen, I wish to state for the record that the forthright stand my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has always taken in defending and preserving the civil liberties of citizens has in my opinion tended to strengthen the fight against un-American activities. The Un-American Activities Committee is faced with a problem of great import and complexity. There are many factors involved—not the least of which is the careful preservation of the rights of Americans under the Constitution. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has always been sympathetic to our committee and his cool and reasonable judgment has been most helpful.

While I am from Georgia it so happens that my district adjoins that of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I know many of the people whom he has represented so well during his 9 years in Congress. They accord him the same high respect as his many colleagues and I do. The gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER, is a fine American true to the ideals of the Constitution. He stands, and has always stood for the principles on which our great democracy was founded. I sincerely hope that the people of Tennessee will not be misguided in their appraisal of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] by the words of a political boss.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as one who came to Congress about the time Representative ESTES KEFAUVER came, I desire to pay tribute to him. Throughout the many years Estes has served in the House, he has been recognized as one of the most able, competent, and conscientious Members in the House. He is known for his hard work and sincere devotion to the principles in which he believes. In many ways, and often, he has demonstrated his courage and initiative. The people of his district have been fortunate to have been represented by so distinguished a person. We, his colleagues, shall miss him as a legislator and as a friend. We are not happy that he is leaving the House; however, we wish him every good fortune in his undertakings.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the retirement from the House of the gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER, will be a great loss, particularly to the Committee on the Judiciary, on which committee it has been my privilege to serve with him. His keen legal mind has been of tremendous help to the committee. Mr. KEFAUVER has been quick to recognize restrictive measures in proposed legislation that might deprive the individual of his constitutional rights—rights which he has worked untiringly to protect, strengthen, and preserve. Mr. KEFAUVER has been ever diligent in his efforts to further the opportunities of the ordinary man. This capable, personable gentleman leaves the House of Representatives, where he has so ably served his constituency and our Nation, with the best wishes of his colleagues, and we, as one, bid him good fortune.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that it has been a distinct pleasure and privilege to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. He has served with marked ability and unusual fidelity to his duties. As a legislator and a good friend, we shall miss him.

May I express to the gentleman the hope, if the great State of Tennessee is to be represented in the other body by a member of the Democratic Party, as seems to be a reasonable, if not desirable prospect to contemplate, that the senatorial crown by action of the electorate may rest upon the brow of our colleague who will carry it with dignity and credit to those who select him.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with other Members of the House in expressing appreciation for the services in this body of our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and in voicing our regret that he is leaving the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has given conscientious and faithful service to the Third Tennessee District, to the State of Tennessee, and to the Nation.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee he has been a close student of legislation and has assisted in the writing of important bills for that committee.

As he leaves the House now, voluntarily, I am sure the good wishes of his colleagues will go with him.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know the gentleman from Tennessee for many years before he became a Member of this House. I observed his activities as a civic leader and outstanding member of the bar of Chattanooga. I know of his high standing in the section of the South with which he has been identified. I appreciate his contribution to the solution of the great problems which have engaged us here. His splendid training as a lawyer, his studious disposition, his kind and generous treatment of those associated with him, and his qualities of progressive leadership have won the admiration of his colleagues and the appreciation of a multitude of American citizens.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that ESTES KEFAUVER is leaving us. He is a man of outstanding ability and has been a pleasant, understanding gentleman to work with. His loss will be deeply felt by every Member of the House.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the people of ESTES KEFAUVER'S district and of the State of Tennessee are losing a most capable, hard-working, and intelligent Representative. During the years we have served here together I have gotten to know ESTES KEFAUVER well. He has come before the Appropriations Committee many times. He always presents his case clearly and forcibly and he knows the facts of his case. I consider him one of the top-notch Members of this body. He is the type of man we need in public service, and I hope he may continue in the upper body.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to serve with my colleague [Mr. KEFAUVER] on numerous unofficial committees. I regret that he is leaving the Congress, for he is a man of high ideals in the best American tradition. In times like these we need able men like Mr. KEFAUVER—men with fearless courage willing to grasp the complex issues before us and grapple with them until they are solved.

ESTES KEFAUVER has earned the high reputation he enjoys among us here by his hard work, sound judgment, and kindly consideration he has always had for the views and problems confronting his fellow colleagues. I wish him the utmost success in the future and want him to know that he will always carry my sincere best wishes with him.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest regret that I say farewell to my friend and colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER. He is a sincere, hard-working American and it has been a great pleasure to be associated with him in Congress. ESTES has established one of the finest records of any man here and has been a real credit to his district, his State, and his country. I hope I have the pleasure of working with him for many years to come.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many other Members share in my regreat that so valuable a Member of Congress as my colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER, is leaving us. His work here has earned the respect of all of us. He is a man of clear judgment and outstanding ability. I have enjoyed working with him here in Congress and I look forward to his continued success in the future.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in voicing my sincere regret that he is leaving the House of Representatives after having served so faithfully and ably not only his own district and State, but also the Nation.

He is a man of great ability and is highly regarded not only by the members of his own party, but also by the members of the majority party. He has contributed much in constructive legislation while in Congress.

A year ago it was my privilege to be his guest in Tennessee and to view the great Tennessee Valley Authority projects, for which he had worked so energetically ad capably. He has, as a Member of the House, consistently worked for and with the people of his district and State for legislation beneficial to his people. He has been in Congress a recognized leader of his party, an outstanding Member of the House.

We will miss him, not only as an outstanding legislator, but also as a sincere and lovable friend.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, may I join with the many other Members of the House in expressing my regrets that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER, has decided to leave us and seek the select and rarefied air of that great deliberative body on the other side of this building. Not only will we miss his warm and attractive personality, but the House of Representatives will lose one of its finest minds, its most energetic workers and one of its true and inspirational leaders. The gentleman from Tennessee has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues here in the House, and by his accomplishments he has earned the right to represent the people of Tennessee in the United States Senate.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us will miss the ready smile and hearty handshake of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. In leaving us he takes with him the best wishes of the membership. He has well represented his district, State, and Nation. Good luck, Estes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, during my 6 years in Congress I have learned to love and admire the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. His ability, his sincerity, and his willingness to work early and late, and his genial disposition, endeared him to his colleagues. We will all miss him in the House, but we look forward to his well-merited promotion in the Congress by service in the Senate of the United States. I am happy to count him as one of my closest friends in the Congress.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my policy to encourage my friends to seek the goal that will bring them the utmost satisfaction and that will provide an opportunity for the personal growth.

In this instance I am glad to know of Representative KEFAUVER'S ambition to enter the Senate of the United States, and I do wish for him success in this effort. However, his fine record in the House is something of which he should be very proud. His devotion to the work of the House has earned for him the respect and confidence of every Member.

We shall all feel his absence keenly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many Members who have the highest praise for the invaluable service which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has rendered during his years in the House. His diligence, great ability and excellent judgment has gained him the confidence and respect of all of us, including Democrats and Republicans alike. In addition, his unfailing courtesy has always been refreshing. All wish him good luck and success.

MR. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to state that it has been a great pleasure and a source of inspiration to have had the opportunity to serve with my colleague and associate on the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER of the great State of Tennessee. His devotion to duty, his fair and impartial approach to all bills before our committee are all to his great credit. ESTES has been kind, sympathetic, and understanding upon every occasion that I have sought his friendship, consideration, and support. His ability as an attorney, his judicial mind, and his leadership shall be sorely missed when he voluntarily retires from the House of Representatives.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of genuine regret to me that Mr. KEFAUVER is retiring from the House. It so happens that he and I have been interested in some of our congressional problems and have cooperated one with the other. I have found him to be an earnest, intelligent and sincere legislator—the kind we all appreciate and admire. I hope he will continue in the service of his country.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is an uncommon privilege to serve in this House but a more rare privilege to work with a Member who measures up to the high caliber and is possessed of the sterling character and productive ability of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I remember when first he came to Congress for he made his impression early and well. Never to my knowledge has he failed to devote his intellectual attainments and his inexhaustible energies to the welfare of his constituents and his country. I shall miss him and his sound reasoning. His departure from this Chamber I trust precedes his graduation to the Senate where the Senatorial toga to drape his broad shoulders awaits him. He will contribute to that august body at the other end of the Capitol the same sound reasoning, help and virility that he so unselfishly and generously gave to the House. May the good people of Tennessee and of his district reward him for his patriotic service by promotion to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend and fellow Member, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Estes, as we affectionately know him, leaves this great body voluntarily. We are going to miss him. We will miss his sound counsel and advice.

But, while we grieve at his leaving the House we rejoice in the thought that he is waging a forceful campaign for election to the other branch of this Congress, and we wish him success in his race.

The gentleman from Tennessee has contributed much to the Government of our great country and it is my hope that, in or out of Congress, he will continue his fine service to his fellowman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to say that, among all the outstanding men I have met in this House, none has impressed me more with his sincerity, his ability, his interest in mankind, and his loyalty to his country, his State, and his constituents than the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. We on this side of the aisle are losing a great colleague, a loyal Democrat. The House is losing a faithful servant. He has made a great record here. We have confidence that the high level of public service which he has rendered here will characterize his activities in his new undertakings.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am one of many Members of this House who are genuinely sorry to know that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] will no longer be with us.

All during my tenure of office in this body I have appreciated and admired the distinguished gentleman's ability, and statesmanship. He brought to this body an intelligence and integrity that contributed greatly to the deliberations of this body. It is such men as he that has enabled this body to carry on through the most difficult and critical times in the history of our Nation. His attributes are rare and shared by few. For this reason, I have held him in the highest esteem.

My earnest wish is that he will soon grace the other body, thus bringing to that body the high character and great qualities that he gave to this body.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to learn that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. ESTES KEFAUVER, will not be a Member of this body next year. He has made an enviable record and no man in the House is regarded more highly by this body.

We wish him great success in all his endeavors, and should he become a Member of the other body I am sure the people of Tennessee will be well represented.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, when Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER leaves the House of Representatives we lose one of the most able and outstanding Members of this body. He has been a forward-looking Representative of his people in every instance where their welfare might be in jeopardy. Our good wishes go with him as he leaves our midst.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I hear my friend and colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] state that he will not be with us in the House next Congress. It will be a distinct loss to this body to have him leave it. I regard my friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] as one of the strongest Members here during my membership.

I have never seen or visited the physical plant of the great Tennessee Valley

Authority, but I have gained a favorable impression of it. A large part of my knowledge of TVA and the good impression I have of it has been gained through the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. He has been a great friend and stanch defender of this highly important and controversial development. I know he will continue to support and foster this and every other significant and worthy cause for his State and Nation.

Mr. LANHAM of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was not until the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] spoke his few brief words of farewell to the House a few moments ago that the realization was brought to me that he would not be a Member of the House during the next session of Congress.

Before I came to Washington as a Member of the Eightieth Congress I did not know ESTES KEFAUVER personally although I had heard much of the splendid record he had made in the Congress. Since coming to Washington I have learned to love, admire, and respect him very much.

Mr. KEFAUVER is recognized by his colleagues as one of the ablest and most progressive Members of Congress; and when I say he is progressive in his thinking and approach to public questions I mean that he is progressive in the true sense of the word and in no sense a radical.

Mr. KEFAUVER is one of a group of the younger and more forward looking Members of Congress who have done a wonderful job in reorganizing and streamlining the Congress. I have read with interest and I trust with profit, his book entitled "Twentieth Century Congress." In that book, which should be read by every Member of Congress, as well as every person in America interested in seeing the Congress work more effectively and speedily in the public interest, Mr. KEFAUVER makes many recommendations and suggestions to speed up the democratic process. I am of the opinion that most, if not all of the things suggested by Mr. KEFAUVER in his book could well be adopted by the Congress in the interest of a more vital and effective functioning of our great democracy.

I have felt especially close to Mr. KEFAUVER because of the fact that he represents a district in the State of Tennessee which adjoins the great Seventh Congressional District of Georgia which I have the honor and privilege of representing. I have been proud to call him my neighbor and friend.

I can say without disparaging in any way the distinguished junior Senator who now represents the State of Tennessee and without passing upon the merit of the other candidate for the Senate from that great State that ESTES KEFAUVER would be a most worthy and able representative of his State in the United States Senate.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important committees in the House of Representatives is the great and dignified Committee on the Judiciary, to which are referred more bills on more varied subjects than any other committee.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress I was assigned to that committee along with the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, of the Third Tennessee District. His keen mind, lofty character, and fine ability were instantly recognized by our chairman, and to him were assigned many of our most arduous and difficult tasks.

He is one of the best-educated lawyers in the House. Progressive in his views on modern problems, yet he is a stickler for the fundamentals and the recognized principles of law and government.

He is stalwart, both mentally and physically, and his 10 years' service to his people and to our country has been magnificent.

His retirement from the House of Representatives will be a distinct loss to his committee and to the whole House. We will miss him greatly.

It is my hope that the people of his great State recognize his meritorious services, and I join his many friends in wishing him happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I know I voice the sentiments of the House of Representatives when I say that we shall miss the long and valued services of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER. However, I am sure that this loss will only be a temporary one because the people of Tennessee will select him to represent them in the United States Senate.

No one has been a more consistent champion of the development of the great resources of the Tennessee Valley than ESTES KEFAUVER. The people of Tennessee are fortunate, indeed, in having such an able advocate in the Congress of the United States.

During his long service on the Judiciary Committee he has gained a reputation as one of the outstanding constitutional authorities in the Congress. He has always fought for and supported those measures which were in the public interest. It was my particular good fortune to have served with him during the past 7 years as a member of the House Small Business Committee. He has been a zealous guardian of the interest of the small-business men in America. He rendered an outstanding service to the country as chairman of the Subcommittee on Business Monopoly in the last Congress. The small-business men of America will not forget his tireless efforts in their behalf.

All of us join in wishing him many more years of public service in behalf of his country.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the other colleagues of ESTES KEFAUVER in paying tribute to this outstanding statesman. Here in Congress, we might be listed as Democrats or Republicans or of any other political faith, but among ourselves we have other standards, such as: Does he fight for what he thinks is right, has he ability, is he fair and honest, and does he respect the beliefs of others? My association with ESTES has convinced me that he qualifies in every respect.

I also must state that TVA is losing in the House one of its great champions.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my other colleagues in expressing my deep regret in saying farewell to my good friend and coworker, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman KEFAUVER.

I have, through these past 9 years that I have served with him, learned to have a deep respect for his ability, personality, understanding of governmental problems.

His help was tremendous in our effort to reorganize the Congress. The great contributions he made to bring about a better legislative branch will be long remembered. He is a genuine student of legislative government and his understanding has, and I hope will, continue to aid the Congress in improving its machinery and its procedures.

I have followed his voting record closely over these years and have admired and largely concurred with his carefully arrived at and courageous decisions.

The loss of Representative KEFAUVER from this body is a deep blow—one which I hope will be compensated, however, by his service on the other side of the Capitol. We can ill afford to lose such an able Member when the Nation faces such grave problems as it does today.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the proudest term I know is the single word, "American." That word stands for many things in the eyes of the world—for courage, for kindness, for tolerance, for religious liberty, and political freedom.

Among the colleagues with whom I have had the honor of serving in this House who particularly deserve the highest praise for their genuine Americanism is the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

When it would have been easy for him to follow along with blind hysteria, he has stood firm for the American way. He has proved by his votes, even though he knew that they might cost him shortsighted support, that to him it was more important to be right than to seize a temporary advantage.

ESTES KEFAUVER has supported good legislation consistently courageously, and militantly.

He has applied the same qualities in opposing bad legislation.

His voting record in Congress could be taken as a guide for wise representation of his constituency. All of us might do well to measure our own records against his.

He will be missed in this House.

ESTES KEFAUVER is a man, and a Congressman, of whom Thomas Jefferson would have approved.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, during the terms I have served in this House, many Members have come and gone. We have lost valuable Members through death—the whims of politics—and those who have left to follow other pursuits.

I have listened to my good friend and colleague, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, say farewell to those with whom he has so ably served.

Tennessee has contributed many statesmen to our great democracy, and I know of none who gives more promise of emulating the greatest of these than the gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER.

Though he does not return as a Member of the House of Representatives, yet he will still be with us in spirit, and the contributions he has made to this body, will long be gratefully remembered.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, as one who has served 10 years in the Congress and who has come to know the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER well, I wish to join with others in paying high tribute to him.

During this session of the Congress it has been my pleasure to serve on the Judiciary Committee of the House along with Mr. KEFAUVER. About one-third of all the bills introduced in the Congress in this session have been referred to the Judiciary Committee. Perhaps more useful and constructive legislation has come from this committee than any other. Mr. KEFAUVER is recognized as one of the most able members of this distinguished committee.

On a purely selfish basis we regret his seeking promotion to the Senate. However, for patriotic reasons we wish him much success in his current campaign. He would make a United States Senator of which all Tennessee could justly be proud.

At this time, however, I wish to refer to only one of the outstanding contributions Mr. KEFAUVER has made to the Congress. I wish to acknowledge with gratitude his sponsorship of electoral reform. Mr. KEFAUVER was one of the first and most effective advocates of a constitutional amendment to change the method by which we elect Presidents. House Joint Resolution 9, reported by the Judiciary Committee of the House without a dissenting vote, and Senate Joint Resolution 200, reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate with but one dissenting vote, currently known as the Gossett-Lodge resolution, was in large part the handiwork of ESTES KEFAUVER. Through effective and able advocacy he has been able to create much support for this proposed amendment in the Congress. In the opinion of many of us, this reform is essential if American democracy is to survive. As a Member of the United States Senate, Mr. KEFAUVER can and will continue his able espousal of this cause. He can and will contribute materially to its early enactment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, like all other Members of the House, I deeply regret the retirement from this body of the able and distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. During his service here he has commanded the respect and high regard of the House. Capable, aggressive, conscientious and forward-looking, he has consistently been a vigorous and able advocate of every principle or measure that he sponsored and a worthy representative of his district. Of gracious and amiable manner he very naturally enjoys many warm friendships among us who will miss his presence in this body.

It is not surprising, therefore, that he has answered the summons of a higher responsibility, the quest for a greater public duty in perhaps a wider field of service. Our very best wishes attend him as he proceeds to achieve his aspirations and I am honored and happy to add my testimony to that of my colleagues in expressing regret upon the departure of such a distinguished Member and conveying to him my own sentiments that good will, good fortune, and success in the future may be his lot. May he enjoy higher flights and happier landings.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I join those who contemplate with regret the departure from Congress of the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER. He has made a great record; a record which is symbolic of the devotion to ideals, the perseverance, and the splendid ability he has shown. His place here will not easily be filled.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to publicly acknowledge my deep appreciation for the privilege of having sat side by side on the House Judiciary Committee with Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. My assignment to the Judiciary Committee followed closely the assignment of Mr. KEFAUVER.

As revealed from the history of the Judiciary Committee of the House, as prepared by our colleague and fellow committeeman the Honorable LOUIS E. GRAHAM, of Pennsylvania, many outstanding men have served there. Mr. KEFAUVER came to us with a splendid educational and practical background, well qualified for the many duties incident to his assignment. Strong of body, alert of mind, eager for work; no other member of our committee has done a better job.

The voluntary retirement of ESTES from the House leaves a vacancy which will be difficult to fill. By reason of his many sterling qualities, a strong bond of friendship prevails throughout the committee's entire membership regardless as to party lines.

I am sure that this humble expression of appreciation and loss by the retirement of Mr. KEFAUVER is shared in by our entire committee. May the Lord add strength and length to his already fruitful life.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Tennessee, Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, voluntarily retires at the end of the Eightieth Congress he will leave behind a most distinguished record of service. He was elected first to the Sixty-ninth and each succeeding Congress by the people of his district by overwhelming majorities.

This decade of service to the people of Tennessee as well as the Nation is a record of painstaking, diligent, and unselfish work.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Tennessee will continue to seek the opportunity to use the service of our sincere, honest, and faithful colleague.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard with regret of the voluntary retirement of Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, from the House of Representatives. During his long tenure he has demonstrated marked ability and has won the respect of his colleagues by his fine service to his people. He has consistently supported the progressive legislation advocated by the Democratic Party during his service. His departure will be a real loss to the House and to the Nation.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that our colleague, Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, is offering his services to the State of Tennessee by reason of being a candidate to the United States Senate.

I have observed Mr. KEFAUVER's work in the House of Representatives for the past 6 years, and in my judgment he is one of the most effective Members of this body. He has been most diligent in carrying out the trust imposed on him by the people in his district in Tennessee, and I am confident if he is successful in his quest for a seat in the Senate, he will serve the people of Tennessee with honor and distinction.

I do not believe there is a Member of the House who is more admired and respected by his colleagues than is ESTES KEFAUVER, or one who has a better record of service to his country and to his State and district.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of genuine regret to Members on both sides of the aisle that our distinguished colleague the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER is retiring from the House. Industry, integrity, and ability have marked his record of service. I have learned to know him well in the decade we have served together in this Chamber, and I entertain for him affectionate regard. May good fortune and happiness attend him all the days of his life.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress we are turning our thoughts toward returning home and leaving our tasks here in Washington and at the same time parting with those whom we have been associated with in our committee work and in the Congress. At this time I want to express my regrets that we are not going to have with us on the Committee of the Judiciary one of our very good members who has served in the Congress for the past 9 years.

Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER has been one of our hard-working Members. He was highly respected by the entire membership of the House and his opinions and judgment were eagerly sought on the many intricate problems which came before our committee. He has contributed a great deal toward the fine record made by that outstanding committee. He acted as chairman of the committee investigating the conduct of one Judge Johnson, who as a Federal judge was accused of misconduct. He applied himself very diligently to the work and as a result of the investigation which the committee undertook, the judge resigned from the bench. He was determined to see to it that if there was any malfeasance in office it should be uncovered and the guilty ones exposed. His work has been praised by the entire committee. He has spared no effort to see that justice be done. He is not seeking reelection to the House of Representatives but is a candidate for United States Senator. I wish him well. He has earned any ambition he may seek as a public servant. He has been tested and not found wanting. If elected to the Senate he will give the people of the State of Tennessee excellent representation. His experience

in the House qualifies him for the office and Tennessee will have a very fine and outstanding Senator. I wish him well and hope that he will enjoy good health and many, many years of success and happiness.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for some time it has been my privilege to serve with ESTES KEFAUVER on the Judiciary Committee of the House. We have worked together on such important matters as the Administrative Procedure Act, the Contract Settlement Act, and many others. Several years ago I was a member of a special committee, of which he was chairman, to consider impeachment proceedings against certain district judges in Pennsylvania.

As a result of this close association I have come to know ESTES very well. In my judgment, he is one of the most able Members of the House. He has an excellent legal mind, which enables him to go at once to the root of any problem. He is one of the hard working Members of the Congress, and possesses executive ability to an unusual degree. He has been very mindful of his obligations to his constituents and to his country.

I shall remember ESTES as a worthy Member of Congress, a sturdy American, and a true friend.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which should have been presented to the Congress long ago. Air parcel post is badly needed in this country. I do not believe that anyone will insist that air parcel-post service should not be inaugurated at this time. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] will agree with that statement. Their opposition to this bill stems out of the fact that the measure provides that air parcel post shall be carried by air-mail carriers. They contend that certain noncertificated cargo carriers should have an opportunity to carry this air parcel post. In my opinion, air parcel post can be carried effectively and efficiently only by regularly scheduled air-mail carriers. I have an interest in these noncertificated cargo carriers. They have appeared before our committee. I have met many of them personally. I appreciate the great fight that they are making in the development of air cargo transportation. They now have an application with the Civil Aeronautics Board for a certificate. The application will be acted upon. If they are given a certificate, then they will be eligible to receive an air-mail contract and can then carry air parcel post.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. The nonscheduled air cargo carriers, the veterans, have had their applications for certificates in for three years, and not one veteran air line has been given a certificate. That is why they want a regular route. The veterans can carry this mail 40 cents cheaper per ton mile than the other carriers.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I will say to my friend from Massachusetts that an application for a certificate is now pending before the CAB.

Mr. KENNEDY. It has been pending for three years.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Hearings have been held upon it. I understand that action will be taken at an early date. I appeal to you to pass this bill. It provides for the carriage of air parcel post by zone rates just like the zone rate for surface transportation. However, the rates are so high that they cannot be in competition with surface transportation, by train, for example. The railroads do not oppose it. The Railway Express Company does not oppose it. It is a service that is urgently needed for the shipment of perishables and medicine, for parts and other articles from one coast to another, and to all sections of the United States.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. The statement was made before that the present certificated air mail carriers are receiving payment for space that is not used.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. KEOGH. And that they will be able to utilize that space for this parcel post.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. KEOGH. The utilization of that space for parcel post will in nowise decrease air-mail payments; will it?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Certainly not.

Mr. KEOGH. If the gentleman will excuse me, did he answer that it will not? Therefore, in fact, they will be paid twice for the same space.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. No, no. Let me tell the gentleman from New York this: At the present time, under the decisions of the CAB, the Post Office Department is paying for 20,000,000 tons that are not being used. Now, if those 20,000,000 tons are used for this new air parcel post, then it will not cost the Post Office Department one single penny for the carriage of the mail for this unused space. Let me tell you furthermore that on all small trunk lines the CAB has fixed a minimum load of 300 pounds. That is what the Post Office Department has to pay for; yet none of these lines carry over an average of 75 to 100 pounds of that 300 pounds. The balance of around 200 pounds can be utilized in the carriage of air parcel post, and it will not cost the Post Office Department one penny to use that space.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I wish the gentleman would permit me to finish first. I have already yielded to the gentleman and cannot yield at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the present bill if enacted into law will provide for the carriage of air parcel post to 400 cities. Two hundred other cities are now waiting for air service. They will also soon receive air parcel post if this bill becomes law. I ask my friends: How can noncertificated, nonscheduled carriers carry air parcel post? Air parcel post should go the same as any other kind of air mail.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield to me to answer that question as to how they can carry it?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. It has to be carried on regular schedules, the same as any other mail. I trust the Members will vote for this bill.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to reply to those who have been defending the independent carriers.

I will say that our committee did give consideration to the problem they have discussed this afternoon. We gave it very careful consideration. As far as the chairman of this committee is concerned, he feels that the CAB has not probably been as fair as it might have been with respect to its treatment of the independent air freight carriers, but what we are discussing this afternoon is the question of the use of a great deal of space, some $10,000,000 worth of space, that is not being presently used. We feel it should be used.

I will say to the gentleman that consideration will be given to their problem. We expect to hold hearings in regard to it and try as far as we can to help them work out their problem. We are in sympathy with their contention, but we have had full hearings on this bill and recommended what we believe to be the best bill considering the circumstances.

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The veterans did present a bill to your committee that would have taken care of these problems, and it was turned down completely.

Mr. REES. Well, they did submit their proposal and the committee did not recommend it.

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

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

Mr. KEOGH. If the chairman expresses the thinking of his committee, has he not presented to the House the best argument for deferring action on this bill until that matter can be taken up?

Mr. REES. The chairman is speaking about his own thinking in regard to those people, but he does feel it is utterly improper for us to allow this $10,000,000 worth of space to go to waste. We think it ought to be used. I think the gentleman from New York agrees with me. We are not shutting anybody out. We are trying to use something that we have and have paid for and not presently using.

Mr. KEOGH. Anyone who knows the distinguished gentleman knows the standing he has with his committee.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his forthright statement in behalf of the veteran-operated cargo air lines. I know that he has made a detailed and careful

study of this situation, especially in regard to the apparent inequity that now exists. I hope the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will look into this situation further at the earliest possible moment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds have voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 2281, being an identical bill with the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the rate of postage on mailable matter exceeding 8 ounces in weight, but not weighing more than 70 pounds nor measuring more than 100 inches in length and girth combined, when carried by air and including other transportation to and from air-mail routes, shall, except as otherwise herein provided, be determined on the basis of the 8 postal zones established for fourth-class matter, as follows:

(1) For delivery within the first or second zones, 55 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(2) For delivery within the third zone, 60 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 8 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(3) For delivery within the fourth zone, 65 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 14 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(4) For delivery within the 5th zone, 70 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 24 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(5) For delivery within the 6th zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 33 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(6) For delivery within the 7th zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of eight ounces, plus 45 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(7) For delivery within the 8th zone, which, with respect to air parcel post, shall include all offices located in continental United States beyond the 7th zone, 80 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof over 8 ounces, plus 65 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(8) For air parcels exchanged between offices in continental United States and offices in Territories and possessions of the United States, in either direction, and between offices within such Territories and possessions, the applicable zone rate shown in paragraphs (1) to (6) of this section shall apply to and including the seventh zone: *Provided*, That for offices falling in the eighth zone the rate of postage for air parcels weighing in excess of 8 ounces shall be 80 cents for each pound or fraction thereof.

(9) Mailable matter of light weight in relation to size shall be subject to such surcharge as may be determined by the Postmaster General to be warranted by reason of the extra space and care required in handling and transporting such mail matter.

(10) The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 973), as amended, or any order, rule, or regulation made by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder, as may be necessary for the safe and expeditious transportation by air of mail matter weighing in excess of 8 ounces.

(11) The Postmaster General is further authorized and directed for the period of 2 years, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) to (9), inclusive, of this section, to adjust from time to time the weight limit, size, rate of postage, zone or zones or conditions, or either, in order to promote the service to the public and assure the receipt of revenue from such service adequate to pay the cost thereof.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized, in the disbursement of the appropriation for domestic air-mail service, to apply a part thereof to the purpose of leasing suitable quarters at public airports for use in the handling and distribution of air mail at a reasonable rental to be paid quarterly or monthly, for a term not exceeding 20 years.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public law 730, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), entitled "An act to fix the rate of postage on domestic air mail, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The rate of postage on domestic air mail weighing 8 ounces or less shall be 5 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That the rate of postage on air mail of the first class weighing in excess of 8 ounces shall be the rate provided for air parcels but in no case shall be less than 3 cents an ounce or fraction thereof."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the third month following the month of enactment.

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS BETWEEN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF., AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6633) to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the same.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "Secretary", insert "after receiving the written approval of the Attorney General as to the titles, leases, and other mutual conveyances connected therewith."

Page 6, line 9, strike out all after "Navy" down to and including "and" in line 21 and insert "and shall cease to be used for a period of 2 years by any branch of the armed services of the United States for military or naval purposes, then and in that event, the said lease shall terminate, be canceled and be of no further effect, and the city shall have the immediate right to reoccupy said lands."; and."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, 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 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 [Mr. PHILLIPS]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. PHILLIPS of California, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, and Mr. THOMAS of Texas.

LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to bring to the attention of the House a radio broadcast by Mr. Martin Agronsky over the American Broadcasting System.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to bring to the attention of the House a radio broadcast by a Mr. Martin Agronsky recently over the American Broadcasting Company's network from New York which is so replete with false charges and propaganda against Members of Congress that it cannot go unanswered in all justice to all good Americans both in and out of Congress.

After this broadcast was made, I requested a copy of Mr. Agronsky's broadcast, which I received several days later, and after the gentleman had made several changes in his charges, which I discovered in checking his exact spoken words against the altered copy he sent me. You will note as I read these charges that the gentleman from New York the Honorable JOHN TABER comes in for criticism, but the truth is that at no time has the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] taken part in the subcommittee hearings on this bill for the 1949 fiscal year appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, nor did he at any time make recommendations to the committee on language or on amounts in the bill, but simply gave his approval to the bill when it came before the full Appropriation Committee of the House, of which he is chairman. Consequently, to the members of the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations, of which I have the honor of being chairman, must go the blame or credit for the bill as reported to the House of Representatives May 26 last.

I invite everybody in America to examine the action taken by the committee

and the Congress on this bill, a great part of which is for the orderly and more rapid development of our 17 Western States.

CHARGES

As the Presidential nominating convention draws near and the Eightieth Congress steps on the legislative gas to meet its June 19 adjournment deadline, it becomes increasingly difficult for the public to see through the obscuring clouds of political oratory exactly what's happening on the floor of the House and Senate to some of the most vital issues affecting our contemporary way of life.

This morning, because it's important that Americans, getting ready to elect a new President and a substantially new Congress, see clearly and very clearly just what that Congress is doing, I want to report in some detail on an obscure piece of legislation. This legislation consists of a series of amendments and riders attached by the House Appropriations Committee under the chairmanship of Republican Representative JOHN TABER to the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior.

ANSWERED

The purpose in his opening statements is to set the stage for an attack upon Republican handling of the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1949 in the House of Representatives. He refers to this bill and amendments as "an obscure piece of legislation" and to the debate upon the bill as "obscuring clouds of political oratory." He indicates that he, as a radio commentator reporting the news, will reveal the facts concerning Republican trickery in passing the bill.

"Obscure" means shaded, darkened, hidden, and remote from observation. Shadowy, mysterious, and unknown are synonyms. Interior Department appropriation bills are not "obscure" in any sense of the word. They are, each year, among the most important annual supply bills enacted by the Congress. During the last 2 years no legislation, including the Marshall plan, has received such exhaustive treatment and careful consideration.

The organization of the Congress under our two-party system prevents "obscure" legislation or "buried," "misleading" amendments from being enacted. The House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, for the newscaster's information, are composed of Republican and Democratic members; their committees and subcommittees are each composed of Republicans and Democrats. The Republicans being the majority party have a majority membership; the Democrats being the minority or opposition party have a minority membership. The House Appropriation Committee is composed of 25 Republicans and 18 Democrats, and the Interior Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee is composed of 4 Republicans and 3 Democrats. The Democratic members attend and are as familiar with the hearings and with the bill as written and reported as are the Republican members. Each member, Republican or Democrat, has equal rights and privileges on committees. All members are entitled to be present at all committee meetings and to be present when a report is accepted or rejected and when a bill is drafted. Nothing can be hidden; nothing can be buried; nothing can be obscured. The Democratic members, or the representatives of the opposition party, have the responsibility to inform their leadership and party members of the contents of any and all legislation. They were informed concerning all details of this bill. They knew what was in it.

CHARGES

These obscure amendments and riders buried under misleading titles and literally rammed through the House in one afternoon's inconclusive debate last week, threatened to destroy the American Government's whole vast system of power and irrigation projects. They're important. They come into effect by passing the Senate, the Reclamation Act of 1902 brought into being by President Theodore Roosevelt, will be completely nullified and the exponents of power and land monopolies throughout this country will reign supreme.

ANSWERED

Amendments to the bill referred to by the newscaster as "obscure amendments" were printed in the report exactly as they have been printed in reports for years. There has been no change in procedure. Every Member of the House of Representatives is familiar with the make-up of a House Appropriations Committee report. His reference to an amendment "buried under misleading titles" is misleading itself. No one who read the report or bill could have missed the provision to which he referred. They might have objected to it, but they could not have missed it. Anyone who even casually read pages 45 to 49 of the committee's report and the bill itself would not have been misled by a mere editing error. He appears to have been the only person misled, for Members of the House—as the debate reveals—were well familiar with all its contents, including the legislative limitation which he claims was buried. Nothing in the bill destroys or threatens to destroy Federal irrigation or power projects. Nothing in the bill "nullifies" any provision of the Reclamation Act of 1902, and the newscaster submits no evidence to bear out these charges. The report of the committee insisting upon a reemphasis of reclamation constitutes one of the foremost steps taken within recent years to assure that the spirit and the letter of the 1902 Reclamation Act is fulfilled.

CHARGES

Now, what the House of Representatives did in approving by a voice vote, with not more than 100 Members present, this obscure bit of legislation was nothing less than practically insuring that the extension of public power shall eventually be brought to a dead stop and that the famous 160-Acre Act, which is aimed at blocking the provision of irrigation water from Government dams to farms exceeding 160 acres in size, shall be nullified.

ANSWERED

He charges that the House action on the Interior Department bill will bring "the extension of public power * * * to a dead stop" but does not support the charges with facts. His comments were obviously written without reference to the House hearings, the committee report, or the House debate. This man suppressed the fact that the Department of the Interior will have more money next year than in any previous year. The House committee would provide the Interior Department with $375,692,591 for the fiscal year 1949. This compares with $262,801,000 in 1948 and $258,985,716 available in 1947. The same is true of the Bureau of Reclamation for which the House appropriated $226,794,897 for use in the fiscal year 1949. This compares with $136,644,738 available in 1948, the previous peak level—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 1, 1948, page 6751.

Of these huge sums, vast amounts were made available for projects in Western States which involve power as well as reclamation. The Bonneville Power Administration received $20,920,000 exclusively for power developments; the Anderson Ranch Dam in Idaho, which is an irrigation and power project, will have $5,100,000 available for all purposes in 1949; $19,495,000 will be available for the Davis Dam project; $41,396,000 for the Central Valley project; $19,750,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project; $8,100,000 for the Hungry Horse project; $3,192,000 for the Fort Peck project; and over $54,000,000 for Missouri River Basin projects. Of the money made available for the Missouri River Basin project, approximately $4,000,000 was earmarked for transmission lines and substations alone. Millions of dollars were made available for the extension of Federal power in Western States. These facts completely answer this commentator's falsification that the "extension of public power" has been brought "to a dead stop." If, after making millions of dollars available for power there is to be no progress, then this broadcaster should argue for a complete and full investigation of Federal power agencies rather than attack the activities and the motives of the House of Representatives.

Nothing in the 1949 Interior Department appropriation bill as it passed the House related to the 160-acre provision of the 1902 Reclamation Act. No recommendation of the Interior subcommittee or of the full Appropriations Committee and no action taken by the House of Representatives in its consideration of the bill blocks or was aimed at blocking the 160-acre limitation in the 1902 act. This reporter's statement to the contrary notwithstanding, it is still the law of the land.

CHARGES

That 160-acre provision of the Reclamation Act was written with Teddy Roosevelt as its champion to prevent the growth of the land monopoly in this country and to insure the protection and existence of small farms. Everyone knows the aims of the Government power project, the basic ones being, of course, that more Americans can get cheaper power and the national power shortage so dangerous to the national defense shall be overcome.

ANSWERED

At this point the newscaster falsely assumes that providing consumers with power is a basic function of the Federal Government. For this information, furnishing consumers with cheap power is not today and has never been a function of the Federal Government, and the Federal Government does not have the authority to build a power project the primary purpose of which is to furnish consumers with cheap electricity, any more than it can set up a grocery store to sell

food. Under the Constitution, as interpreted by the courts, the Federal Government can build reclamation, navigation, and flood-control projects, and, when economically feasible, can install power-generating facilities to produce power as a byproduct. With regards to Interior Department projects, the function of government is to provide reclamation and irrigation, and not power. Water users are interested in cheap water. Cheap power means that water will cost relatively more, for in the West power is supposed to help pay the cost of reclamation. He failed to report the policy statement of the House Appropriations Committee which appears on pages 20–21 of Report No. 2038 on H. R. 6705, Eightieth Congress, second session:

The committee desires to reemphasize its statement in former reports on the bill, that the reclaiming of arid lands by the construction of reclamation projects is and always has been the primary purpose of the reclamation laws. Development of hydroelectric power is incidental to irrigation and is made as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings. This policy should not be departed from without specific legislation by the Congress.

The Bureau of Reclamation should not use its power and authority or funds entrusted to its care to construct power facilities that are not essential to carrying out the purpose of the reclamation laws. It is unsound and against the principles of our form of government to appropriate Government funds for the construction of transmission lines, switchyards, substations, and incidental facilities where private capital is prepared to provide them.

At a time when it is so essential for the Government to stimulate the creation of taxable property, it is the opinion of this committee that private enterprise should be encouraged. Investment of private capital in tax-paying properties is greatly to the advantage of the Government. Public funds should be invested only where necessary to furnish adequate services or facilities that private enterprise cannot provide. Not only in regard to the production and distribution of electric energy, but also in small or big business enterprise, agriculture, professional services, and banking.

CHARGES

Well, what happened? The story starts with the descent on Congress of one of the most able, active, and influential group of lobbyists on Capitol Hill. These are the lobbyists of the private power companies. These gentlemen, the most prominent of whom is Purcell Smith, who makes $65,000 a year for his efforts and earns it—these gentlemen did yoeman work in the House of Representatives and earned their salaries to a fare-thee-well. Their approach, which the House vote indicates won the approval of the House majority, was to concentrate on legislation by appropriation, since they rightly feared the public outcry that would come if they attempted to change in the open the basic laws affecting power- and public-land policy in our country.

ANSWERED

The shopworn technique of using the so-called power trusts as a convenient political whipping boy with the implication that its lobby was able to unduly influence men of sincerity and integrity to vote against their consciences has lost its blackmailing sting by its repetitive use. In fact it has become a political "roar-back" because it will be interpreted by every right-thinking Member of Congress as a reflection upon himself personally and upon the constituents who placed their trust in his integrity.

During the debate on the floor of the House on this bill, I said:

We hear a great deal of talk about some of us being stooges for this or that organization for private utilities, and for other private interests. As I have said many times before, this committee, not a single member of it, Democrat or Republican, is stooging for anybody but the American people, the taxpayers of America—the good people of America. I resent any such accusation to the very limit of my feeling. I know every member of this committee feels the same way. I am sure there is not a member of the committee on either side of the aisle who has any other purpose than to do a good job for the American people and help develop the West in an orderly, businesslike manner. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6598.)

Representative ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, and a minority member of the committee had this to say during the House debate concerning the charge of utility influence and pressure:

I do not charge anyone with being improperly influenced. Indeed I have strong confidence that such has not happened. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6009.)

In the same breath this commentator also charges House leadership with passing legislation in an appropriation bill. This, for a change, was a correct statement. He fails to explain, however, why there was legislation in this bill. I explained the reason:

The reason we found ourselves compelled to put some language in this bill, to which the chairman of the Public Lands Committee has objected, is because of the fact that he, as chairman of that committtee, has refused to act and to do something about bringing out the legislation that would correct those abuses. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6596.)

In other words, this was the only way to obtain legislative action to correct administrative abuses and malpractices within the Department of the Interior, abuses revealed as a result of extensive hearings not only this year but in previous years. Corrective action was in the interest of good administration and efficient government.

CHARGES

To start with, they were immensely aided by the House subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, headed by Republican Representative JENSEN, of Iowa. This committee, in defiance, by the way, of the congressional reorganization act, decided to hold all of its meetings on Interior appropriations in executive session. That means in secret with no members of the press and the executive departments allowed to be present.

ANSWERED

There was no defiance of the Legislative Reorganization Act, an act which the broadcaster obviously did not bother to read. Section 133 (f) of that act—Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946—provides:

All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

Thus it is left to the standing committee whether or not its sessions will be open or executive. The full House Appropriations Committee duly considered the problem and voted to hold executive sessions, not only on this bill but on all appropriation bills, just as it has always done. In reaching this decision the full committee considered only how its task could best be accomplished. The newscaster overlooks the fact that while the hearings were in executive session, members of the minority or opposition party were present at all times and were completely informed as to the detailed contents of the bill and in a position to make their criticisms known at the time the bill was reported. In fact, minority members have the privilege of filing a minority report if they desire, but none was filed.

CHARGES

Attempts by Bureau of Reclamation and Interior officials to get a hearing before this committee were all rejected. Attempts by Mr. Purcell Smith and his fellows to get a hearing were more successful. And here's how that worked. The Congress has already approved a number of appropriations for the Interior Department to increase its transmission lines and substations in various Government power projects in order to widen the access to the public in the various areas to cheap Government power and electricity. A Mr. James Black, the president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., one of the most powerful private utilities in northern California, appeared before one of the Jensen committees executive session—that's secret session—and demanded that this planned extension of Government power in northern California be stopped. The committee, without hearing a word of rebuttal from the responsible interial—interior—officials of the area, or from pro-Government power, farmers and citizens of the area, took Mr. Black's suggestion and approved it, writing into the appropriations bill as a rider that killed the extension of public power in northern California.

ANSWERED

This is irresponsible reporting. All told, there were 183 appearances by witnesses favoring the Interior Department's budget estimate. There were 21 appearances by utility witnesses. No utility witness testified against reclamation. They opposed Federal spending to build duplicating, or uneconomic transmission lines and related facilities.

The printed record of the hearing comprised 4,684 pages, the largest hearing in the history of the Appropriations Committee. The hearing lasted for approximately 12 weeks. Out of this total accumulated record of 4,684 pages, 2,147 pages related to testimony in support of the Department's power and reclamation program. There was in contrast 223 pages of testimony by utility witnesses.

As for the reference to Mr. James Black, president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the committee records show that he appeared and testified on April 7. There is nothing secret as to who appears and who does not appear. Prior to that date the committee heard testimony from the following Department officials:

Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

Kenneth Markwell, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

Wesley R. Nelson, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

A. R. Golzé, Director of Programs and Finance.

A. O. Babb, Chief, Division of Program Operation.

Walker Young, chief engineer.

H. F. McPhail, Director, Branch of Power Utilization.

J. W. Nixon, Director, Branch of Project Planning.

R. J. Newell, regional director, Region I.

Harold Nelson, assistant regional director, Region I.

G. W. Lineweaver, Director, Branch of Operations and Maintenance.

C. W. Hamilton, chief engineer, Division of Power.

Following April 7, when Mr. Black appeared, the committee heard testimony from the following Department officials:

Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

Kenneth Markwell, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

G. W. Lineweaver, Director, Branch of Operations and Maintenance.

H. F. McPhail, Director, Branch of Power Utilization.

Wesley R. Nelson, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

Richard Boke, regional director, Region II.

Ben Creim, power manager, region II.

J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior.

Oscar Chapman, Under Secretary of the Interior.

William A. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

CHARGES

Another specific example of the same exact kind is provided by the case of Mr. J. E. Corette, Jr., who is the vice president of the Montana Power Co. That's the most powerful private monopoly in that State. Mr. Corette told the committee, again in secret session, that he was against the Government's plan to extend the powerful facilities in his State by adding more transmission lines and substations to existing Government facilities, though in this case, too, Congress had already approved this plan and appropriated money for it, the project was also written out of the Interior bill by an obscure amendment. Again no—no witnesses who might disagree with the private power point of view were called.

ANSWERED

Mr. J. E. Corette, Jr., is revealed in the committee's records as having testified on April 6. Consequently the same department officials testified both before and after his appearance as before and after Mr. Black. Department witnesses had ample opportunity to state and restate their position with regard to any and all items.

CHARGES

The same kind of wrecking action was repeated by the committee, usually after hearing testimony from private power representatives only in regard to Government power extension projects already approved by the Congress for every one of the 17 Western States. That's one way the powerful Committee of Appropriations operated through its equally powerful subcommittee.

ANSWERED

Secretary of the Interior, Julius Krug; Under Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman; Assistant Secretary, Girard Davidson; and other top department witnesses were heard last at the suggestion of the committee, a suggestion which met with the Department's full approval. Concerning this, Interior Secretary Krug stated in his appearance before the committee:

I am particularly appreciative of this chance to appear last rather than first, as you suggested at the outset of these hearings. Appearing at the close of the hearings assures that if you have questions of policy or otherwise that I can answer such questions directly. Also, I would like to know before this record is closed that you have all the facts that you want. (House hearings, Interior Department appropriation bill for 1949, 80th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 1, p. 1053.)

Thus, Department officials had the last word.

CHARGES

Here's another way they worked. On the House floor, with Democratic Congressman AL ELLIOTT, of California, as the sponsor, the Appropriations Committee floor spokesman rammed through what amounts to an unconstitutional bill of attainder, which requires that Bureau of Reclamation top officials must have 10 years engineering experience. That would force the dismissal of the Bureau's two top officials, Michael Straus, the Commissioner, and the regional director, Mr. Boke. Their crime has been that they have faithfully implemented the provisions of the 160-Acre Act on irrigation in California despite the outraged screams of the great land holding companies in that State.

ANSWERED

The amendment requiring that Bureau of Reclamation top officials must have 10 years' engineering experience was not sponsored by the committee. Although I was in charge of the bill for the committee as chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I did not speak on the measure one way or another except to ask that debate be limited. Again this subject came up as an amendment to the bill, and consequently was subject to a point of order. Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, the minority whip in the House, raised the point of order that this was legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair ruled that the amendment was a limitation; that it referred to a part of the appropriation bill, and therefore ruled against the point of order.

Reference to the debate indicated that the House acted as it did because certain top employees of the Bureau were not qualified engineers in jobs requiring vast engineering experience, but operated as publicity agents and propagandists in keeping with their backgrounds.

This story teller implies that it is unconstitutional for Congress to establish qualifications to be met by persons holding responsible positions in the Government. Since it was Congress which created the whole reclamation program by passage of the Reclamation Act of 1902, it is both constitutional and proper for the Congress to set up the qualifications of those persons appointed to carry out this program if it desires. By requiring engineering qualifications for certain positions, Congress is giving legal effect to a personnel custom that had been practiced over a long period and proven highly successful. These two men were the first in a long and brilliant professional history of the Bureau of Reclamation to have held such positions without the qualifications prescribed in this amendment.

CHARGES

The committee operated in yet a third way. They inserted into the appropriation legislation a clause which they buried under the completely misleading title of "Alaskan Investigation." That clause provides that the 3-percent interest collected by the Government on its power and municipal-water projects in any profits made on these projects could no longer be used to extend Government irrigation and cheap electricity to consumers. That money must be returned, instead, to the Treasury immediately. What this means is that automatically the cost of Government power and irrigation would be forced up to and even beyond the prices charged by private companies. Thus the whole key power and water basis of Government water projects would be killed. Interior Department officials told me this provision alone would cause a power-rate increase to consumers nationally ranging from 15 to 38 percent.

ANSWERED

Nothing in the bill was buried. The provision to which he objects here was outlined in the committee report. The fact that the provision was in the bill was well known to the minority members of the committee and therefore minority Members of the House were on notice. The public power grave diggers certainly exhumed the body if this provision was buried, inasmuch as it was a major point of discussion.

It is ironical for this broadcaster to argue that if Federal power projects in the West paid 3-percent interest on their money into the reclamation fund with the stipulation that it not be allocated, that this would force the price of Federal power up beyond prices charged by private companies. If this is true—if Federal power is so inefficient and depends so completely upon subsidies—then the Government had better get completely out of the power business and stay out.

CHARGES

There are many more of these obscure amendments written into the Interior appropriations bill. It's worth noting again that all of the hearings during which these amendments were written were held in secret. The committee only released them for scrutiny by the press and Government officials on the morning of the day that it agreed with the House Rules Committee to bring the whole bill on to the House floor for debate.

ANSWERED

The Elliott amendment was not written into the bill in committee but was incorporated into the bill by an amendment offered from the floor. The other legislative limitations and provisions to which the broadcaster objects were made a part of the bill when it was marked up. This was in executive session, and under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, it is required that such action always be taken in executive session regardless of whether the hearings are open or closed. Section 133 (f) of the

Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provides as follows:

All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee, by majority vote, orders an executive session.

CHARGES

Since the hearings covered thousands of pages, it was obviously impossible for those Members of the House who would have fought these wrecking amendments to spot the destructive features. Just to make sure, apparently, that nothing could be done about it anyway, even if they were spotted, the committee rammed through the House on the day of debate a gag rule that forbids points of order being taken and thus killed off any extended opposition debate. They did quite a job.

ANSWERED

Again let it be noted that minority Members were present during all hearings on the bill and at the time the report was presented for reading, and at the time the bill was marked up. They were completely informed at all times concerning its provisions. The House was put on notice to the subject of every provision to which the broadcaster objects.

The bill was debated in the House under a rule forbidding points of order being made against items in the bill as reported. Without this rule one individual out of 435 Members by raising a point of order could thwart the will of the majority and could have prevented long-standing abuses from being corrected. The rule under which the bill was debated did not prohibit amendments being offered. Any objectionable feature of the bill could have been struck out by an amendment and certain features that the House found objectionable were stricken from the bill. It is further to be noted that the amendment to which he takes most violent objection was offered from the floor and was subject to a point of order that was overruled. Further, the rule under which this limitation as to points of order was adopted was submitted to full and complete debate on the floor.

CHARGES

The Senate Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations handled the matter differently and decently. They permitted opponents to testify in open hearing. That brought before that Senate committee a dozen Congressmen, men who had been unable to make their voices heard in their own House and brought denunciations from Republican Governor Warren of California and also from Republican Gov. Sam Ford of Montana.

ANSWERED

The House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee held hearings covering a period of 3 months. At the close of the House hearings Secretary Krug himself stated, "Our people do appreciate the fair and thorough hearings that your committee has conducted during the past 11 weeks. Without exception they have reported that they have had both courteous and attentive consideration and a complete unbridled opportunity to lay the facts before the committee." (House hearings, Interior Department appropriation bill, pt. 1, p. 1053.) Irrespective of what the newscaster reports, not a single Congressman who wanted to be heard in the House was denied that opportunity. Governor Warren of California and Governor Ford of Montana could have appeared had they so desired. Since they did not request time, it is obvious that they did not wish to testify. Contrasted with the opportunity given to any and all witnesses to appear during the House hearings, the Senate Appropriations Committee, in order to accomplish its task and to expedite the enactment of this annual supply bill, found it necessary to limit witnesses, other than department witnesses, to 5 minutes each, and the hearings in the Senate covered 4½ days, compared to 11 and 12 weeks' time in the House.

CHARGES

Now the whole business has such a rotten look to it and the Senate hearings so effectively exposed the rottenness for anyone who cared to listen, that there is some hope that this most successful of all the special interest raids against constructive Government projects will fail. But it needs a lot of publicity still.

ANSWERED

This slur against the processes of the Congress of the United States cannot go unchallenged. It is apparent that this broadcaster has never realized that Government agencies can constitute a special interest group fully capable of raiding the United States Treasury and sticking its hands deep into the pockets of the United States taxpayers. It is hardly rotten for House committees and the House to take every action within its power to protect the interests of the American taxpayers and the solvency of the United States Government and the Nation's credit.

This bill as it passed the House made $375,692,000 available for the fiscal year 1949. This means that the House pared the budget estimate $84,293,000 and prevented a special interest raid of that amount. But, even so, the bill makes $112,876,000 more available for use in 1949 than was provided in last year's bill, an amount which compares with $172,000,000 made available in the fiscal year 1940, the last full fiscal year before the beginning of the national defense program.

CHARGES

The minority whip, JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, said of this legislation and these are his words, "It gives off a strange odor. It's the odor of the power lobby." To the general public the whole rotten business can be summed up in three words for even those with the least sensitive olfactory equipment. And those three words are "It smells bad." And I could sum it up in two words but I have to keep decency in mind.

ANSWERED

Instead of quoting the Democratic minority whip, the broadcaster might have quoted Democrats who are definitely pro-Interior. For example, Representative MURDOCK, Democrat, of Arizona, said:

I want to say to the gentleman how earnestly this subcommittee has worked. I recall coming before this committee late one day and having to wait 2 hours until a dozen other witnesses were heard. But the gentleman and his committee remained long after hours to hear my constituents, for which I want to express my appreciation. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6600.)

Representative KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, and a member of the subcommittee, said:

I * * * want to congratulate the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations and the majority members of that committee. They were very gracious and granted the minority members all the time they wanted to interrogate any witness who appeared before the committee. I am very appreciative of their courtesy. Generally speaking, I think this is a good bill. There are some things in it with which I do not agree and to which I shall call attention. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6602.)

Representative GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, and also a member of the subcommittee, said:

The distinguished gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has labored long and diligently. For many, many weeks we have been sitting long, long hours daily studying the many problems affected by this bill. The distinguished gentleman has been thoroughly fair and considerate of the minority members as well as his colleagues on the majority. * * * We members of the minority have served as a backstop. Our opinions, though they have not prevailed in some of the fundamentals of the bill, have, I think, been taken into consideration. Upon most points in the bill, though in some cases reluctantly, we find ourselves in agreement. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6609.)

Representative JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, said:

It was my pleasure to have the privilege of serving temporarily with the subcommittee in connection with the marking up of a portion of the bill under consideration today. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], painstakingly considered all items of the bill, as did other members of the committee. I know that the chairman did his utmost to give fair and equitable consideration to all matters before the committee. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6616.)

Interior Department appropriation bill, 1949

Amount of budget estimates including supplementals	$474,773,835
Amount of bill as agreed to by conferees	[1] 407,836,497
Bill is under budget estimates	66,936,861
Amount of budget estimates considered by House	$459,970,835
Amount of bill as passed House	375,692,591
House bill under budget estimates	84,278,244
Amount of budget estimates considered by Senate	474,773,835
Amount of bill as passed Senate	422,179,098
Senate bill under budget estimates	52,594,737

[1] And, in addition, contract authorizations totaling $48,947,500.

Total number of witnesses on bill, 424.

Total number of pages of printed hearings, 4,707.

Eleven successive weeks were consumed in hearings, 5 days each week from 10 a. m. to 6 p. m. each day, after which the committee sat in executive session to determine the amounts allowed for the thousands of items in the budget

request for the whole Department of Interior functions.

Data in connection with hearings on reclamation.

There were 33 hearings with representatives of the Department covering a period of 17 days.

A total of 44 departmental witnesses were heard, including 27 from the field.

Other witnesses heard in connection with reclamation matters are as follows:

Senators and Members of the House	42
Outside groups	82
Total	124
Total number of witnesses, including departmental representatives	168

Pages of hearings:	
With department	1,149
With Members and outside groups	729
Total number of pages	1,878

Of all the persons appearing before the committee in connection with reclamation matters not a single witness expressed opposition to reclamation in the Western States as such, and I am sure I am correct in stating that of the 42 Members of Congress who appeared, not one appeared in opposition to any project.

A number of REA officials appeared and representatives of municipalities and people from every walk of life who were interested in more funds for reclamation, power, irrigation, and other activities located mainly in the western part of the country. Not a single person was denied a hearing or unduly limited as to time. Many persons were heard on several different subjects and one departmental witness, Mr. Wright, the Southwestern Power Administrator, was heard on three separate occasions.

APRIL 23, 1948, PART 3

Mr. JENSEN. All right; is there anything else?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for letting me appear before you again, and I appreciate your cooperation.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, Mr. Wright, you realize that we have extended a privilege to you that is not customary, by permitting you to come back before the committee the second time. However, because of the complexity of this controversy, the committee felt that you should have an opportunity to discuss the things which you had discussed before the committee on your first appearance, and I want to thank you for coming before the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. I certainly appreciate it, Mr. Chairman.

MAY 14, 1948, PART 3

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. SCHWABE, do you have any questions?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes. Mr. Wright, of course, we appreciate your being here. This is the third time you have been before the committee in this series of hearings, and this committee, I say without fear of successful contradiction, has given you more consideration and extended you more courtesy than has been extended any other Bureau or group that appeared before us.

Mr. WRIGHT. I appreciate that.

Mr. SCHWABE. This hearing today was due to the fact that you apparently wanted to furnish the committee with information which, I think you utterly failed to furnish at former hearings.

I think that we all know that you are here because you were advised that the committee was not satisfied, that you had made a showing that would justify this committee in appropriating the amount you requested.

We are glad you are here. I personally was the first member of this committee to suggest that you be given this opportunity, and I am glad of it, and happy to have you here.

I want to say, however, that there are some things in this telegram that you sent in that we were not able to understand, and do not understand yet.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to clear them up.

Mr. SCHWABE. That is the reason we have extended this unusual privilege and opportunity to you of being here today.

Mr. STRAUS. We are now drawing to the close of an outstanding hearing. I have been sitting here keeping statistics during this hearing, and I see that this is the end of the thirty-third session on reclamation alone. Reclamation said, as this hearing opened, it looked forward confidently to a helpful hearing, and that the more thorough the hearing was the greater would be the benefit to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the United States. Expectations have been more than fulfilled by this hearing. I say that now, and I want to say it on the record. I do not want it to inhibit the committee from remembering that we are also asking for money when they go to mark up the bill.

This is the first time that we have brought in such a group of field officials. I want the record to show that I consulted with the chairman of the committee, and that we were glad to bring these officials to Washington. We feel it was very worth while from the point of view of the Bureau of Reclamation as well as from the point of view of the committee and the Congress to have those officials come to Washington. You may be interested in knowing that for the purposes of this hearing 27 field officials came to Washington from the reclamation areas, including regional directors, assistant regional directors, and others. Perhaps 16 or 17 people were here from the Washington office. I am only citing Bureau of Reclamation witnesses at this hearing.

The able clerk, who has educated more Reclamation Commissioners than he has before him at the present time, tells me that during these hearings far larger numbers of witnesses who are not members of the Bureau of Reclamation appeared than appeared on this hearing, which is a hearing on the largest budget that has ever been submitted.

The Bureau of Reclamation alone, the out-of-town regional and field officials, traveled a total of 135,000 miles to make an appearance here. They were glad to do so, and the Bureau of Reclamation was glad to have them do so. I would also like to mention that approximately 1,500 square feet of maps were drawn for this hearing. For the Reclamation Bureau witnesses alone the transcript numbered over half a million words, and I think we had some 700 man-days of time of Bureau employees used in connection with these hearings alone, all of which is considerable. Whatever the cost, the Bureau of Reclamation feels that it is a very good investment and it was glad to make that investment. I think that more information has been submitted to this committee at this hearing than any other hearing that I am familiar with in my 16 years of attending hearings. I think that this has been a better hearing than any hearing that I have attended for perhaps 16 years. This is not a task or a burden only for the Bureau of Reclamation, but the Bureau wants to recognize fully that it is an equally heavy task and a burden on the members of this committee and the Members of Congress that have sat patiently through these long sessions and treated us with such courtesy and understanding and sympathy, and also with an increased knowledge of our problems gained not only during these hearings but during the trip that was made last summer.

In conclusion, I want to say that I would like to thank you on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation for the way in which these hearings were conducted, and to state that in our opinion these hearings were fine, full, and fair, and we were delighted to participate in them. We look forward to the result of these hearings, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Straus.

In response to that very glowing and interesting analysis of the hearings and the things that go with it, I have only this to say: The three members of the committee, Mr. SCHWABE, Mr. FENTON, and myself, who made the extended trip to the Western States last year said on every occasion where we made stops—we made little talks numbering a little over 100—the purpose of our trip was for one thing, and one thing alone. That purpose was to see with our own eyes and to hear with our own ears the things that were important to the development of the work. We had but one purpose in mind, and when the time came to consider an appropriation for the many and varied projects, not only the Bureau of Reclamation but every branch of the Interior Department, we would give full and careful consideration to the requests of the Department for every branch of that Department, and for every project.

We also stated that we would go into the matters pertaining to each case thoroughly and completely in an attempt to acquaint ourselves and get full information from the officials of the departments and from such other people as would be interested in any matters pertaining to the duties of the Department of the Interior and the Congress of the United States.

We also stated that we felt that up to that time we had done everything we could, and we will continue to do and carry out the promises made to those people.

When we mark up this bill we will stand by our word. Of course, it is customary to mark up this bill in about 3 days, but I can readily see where we will spend not only 3 days but a week, or possibly longer, in going through each one of these items and talking it over among ourselves in executive session, trying as best as we can to determine what is the right and proper figure, as near as humanly possible, to allow for each item.

Gentlemen, I again assure you that we will carry through and that we recognize the responsibility that rests on the shoulders of the members of this committee. I know that you recognize the responsibility that rests on our shoulders in asking for the American people insofar as the expenditures of money is concerned, as it pertains to this committee. Without a doubt, we will reduce some items, and possibly raise a few even over and above the budget requests. After all, we feel that it is the duty of this committee to use its own judgment to some degree, regardless of what the Budget has sent up as a requested appropriation. However, we do not expect to deviate very far from those requests in raising items to any great degree from what the Bureau of the Budget has requested.

I am sure that I speak for all members of the committee, who act pretty much in unison, in the final analysis, when we get into executive session. Of course, we have some pretty hot arguments about certain items in the bill, but we always have. I suppose that we will have those arguments this time. That is merely a difference of opinion, and we try our best to have a meeting of the minds so that when we bring this bill to the floor of the House it will be in such form that the committee will be in as complete accord as possible on each item.

Gentlemen, I want to say that I am very appreciative, and I know that I speak for the other members of the committee when I say that. I believe we are all appreciative of the manner in which you have presented your requests to this committee, and the desires

that you have shown to give us the information that we requested. We shall now live in hopes that some of the things we had been critical of, rightly or wrongly, will be corrected. If we have been wrong, it has been a mistake of the mind, and not of the heart, because we have no ax to grind other than to do a good job for the American people. I am inclined to feel that that is your purpose. While there are certain individuals that would like to take a broadside at the Members of Congress on occasions, after all, we are all human and must live as best we can in peace and harmony so long as we treat each other as friends and neighbors, and we will get along in this great America of ours.

That is all I have. Thank you, gentlemen.

REVOLVING FUND FOR PURCHASE OF NATURAL FIBERS

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed in the aggregate outstanding at any time $150,000,000. Each such note shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the note. Payment of the purchase price of such notes and repayments thereof by the Secretary of the Army shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. The proceeds of these notes shall be used by the Secretary of the Army, or his duly authorized representatives, as a revolving fund for the purpose of (a) purchasing natural fibers (including cotton waste) produced in the United States, and such other materials, including starch, dyestuff, roller leather, and card clothing as may be used in processing and finishing such fibers; (b) transporting such fibers and other materials to occupied areas, making them available for processing, and having such fibers processed in such areas; (c) insuring such fibers and materials and the products obtained from such processing; and (d) selling products obtained from such processing. In the case of wool, mohair, or flax fiber, only those types and grades shall be purchased hereunder as the Secretary of Agriculture, in the light of supplies on hand in the United States, designates as available for export; and stocks held by Commodity Credit Corporation of the types and grades so designated shall be purchased before other purchases are made of such types and grades. For the purpose of this act an occupied area shall be considered as any liberated or occupied area, which is at the time, occupied by United States forces or such an area occupied jointly with another power or powers when it is considered by the Secretary of the Army to be necessary or desirable to include such an area, in order to carry out United States objectives: *Provided*, That a treaty of peace shall not have been ratified and confirmed for such an area.

SEC. 2. Neither the Secretary, nor any duly authorized representative, shall use the fund created by this act for the purchase of any commodity unless, on the date of purchase of such commodity, it appears in his best judgment that within 15 months after such date—

(a) such commodity will be processed, or used in processing operations, in an occupied area; and

(b) So much of the products obtained from such processing will be sold under such terms and for such currencies as will be necessary to cover, in United States dollars, (1) all amounts expended from the fund in connection with such commodity plus (2) an appropriate portion of the interest payable to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act.

SEC. 3. The proceeds from the sale of products of commodities purchased with moneys from the fund, to the extent of the amounts specified in section 2, shall be returned to the fund.

SEC. 4. Annually after the date of enactment of this act the Secretary of the Army shall make a complete report to the Congress with respect to the status of the fund. At such time as there shall no longer be any occupied area within the meaning of this act, or at such earlier time as the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution shall determine that the fund is no longer required for the purposes of this act, the unobligated balance of the fund shall be repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury; and the Secretary of the Army, as expeditiously as possible consistent with orderly liquidation, (a) shall cause to be sold so much of the commodities purchased with moneys from the fund and products thereof which are then on hand as may be necessary to obtain the amount of any balance then remaining owing to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act, and (b) shall repay such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 5. Fibers and other materials purchased for processing in any particular occupied area may, if a treaty of peace is ratified and confirmed with respect to such area prior to the processing of such commodities, be processed and sold, or sold, in such manner as the Secretary of the Army may deem to be in the best interest of the United States. If, after purchasing any such commodity with moneys from the fund, it shall appear to the Secretary of the Army that the product of such commodity cannot be sold for as much as the amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) of section 2 of this act the Secretary of the Army may sell such product for a lesser amount; but, insofar as may be possible, no commodities shall be sold for less than the amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. So much of the commodities purchased with moneys from the fund for processing in any occupied area and so much of the products thereof as are not required to be sold, and so much of the proceeds obtained from the sale of any such commodities or products as is not required to be returned to the fund shall be used and disposed of by the Secretary of the Army, in such manner as he deems fit, for the benefit of the economy of such occupied area.

SEC. 7. In providing for the performance of any of the functions described in section 1 the Secretary of the Army shall to the maximum extent feasible utilize private channels of trade and is hereby authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations for the efficient implementation of the provisions of this act.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Georgia for 20 minutes.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is offered for the purpose of setting up a revolving fund to aid the textile industries, mostly wool and cotton, in Japan and Germany, countries we now occupy, to aid in their rehabilitation effort.

It is costing the taxpayers of this country today approximately $400,000,000 to help support these people. The purpose of this bill is to establish a revolving fund which may be used from time to time to purchase raw materials for shipment to those countries, under control of the Army and other Government agencies, to be converted into fabrics by the Japanese and German people who work in the mills. This would give employment to people in an industry which represents about 60 percent of their economy.

Before the war Japan furnished a large market for our surplus cotton. That is another purpose of the bill, to help reestablish that market. We have today in this country under control of the Commodity Credit Corporation a large stock of raw wool for which there is apparently no use in this country because it is a kind that our own manufacturers do not use. The bill requires that before any material can be purchased in the open market in this country that CCC stocks will have to be used. That would convert that stock pile into cash and return that money to the Treasury. The bill is meritorious in that respect and has the unanimous support of the Committee on the Armed Services of the House. It was passed in the Senate without a dissenting voice.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words about this bill because it is a very important bill. It is important not only from the standpoint of the industrial rehabilitation of the occupied areas but it also directly affects the pocketbook of every American taxpayer.

What this bill does is to set up a revolving fund under the control of the Secretary of the Army. This fund will be used to finance the purchase of natural fibers produced in the United States—cotton, wool, mohair, and flax fibers. These fibers can then be shipped to Japan, Germany, and other occupied areas where they will be processed by the textile industries of those countries. The finished goods may then be sold either in those countries themselves or exported to other nations. The money borrowed from the revolving fund will then be returned to the fund out of the proceeds of these sales. In this way the textile industries of occupied areas will be provided with working capital which they do not now have and which they need very badly.

I want to make it clear at the outset that this bill does not mean that we are going to give away $150,000,000. This is

a business proposition, and we expect that every cent will be repaid to the fund. We expect, moreover, that a substantial profit will accrue from the proceeds of sales over and above what is necessary to repay the fund. These profits may be used by the Secretary of the Army in any manner he sees fit for the benefit of the occupied areas from which they are derived.

Now, let us see why this bill is important to the taxpayers of the United States.

At the present time, we are appropriating approximately $400,000,000 a year to cover the cost of relief shipments of food and other necessities of life to Japan. We have to do this because Japan today cannot feed herself. Japan has always been a deficiency nation. She has never been able to produce more than 80 percent of her total food requirements. Therefore, in order to feed her people, it has always been necessary for Japan to engage in foreign trade in order that she may buy from other nations the foodstuffs to make up her own deficiencies at home. This was true before the war and is still true today. But in order to engage in foreign trade she must produce commodities for which there is a demand in other countries, so that she may have something to offer in exchange in foreign markets for the food she needs at home. Because every inch of Japanese soil is devoted to the cultivation of foodstuffs for home consumption, Japan cannot hope to produce agricultural commodities in large volumes for export. And so, quite naturally, Japan turned many years ago to the development of her manufacturing industries. She had to do this in order to provide herself with purchasing power in international trade; she also had to do this to provide employment for her own people because there is just not enough land in Japan to keep all the Japanese people occupied in agricultural pursuits.

Before the war the cotton and woolen textile industries were the leading manufacturing industries of Japan. Manufactured cotton goods were Japan's principal export products. Japan was the most important customer of the American cotton farmer, and raw cotton and wool were her leading imports. With the textile commodities which she produced, she was able to buy from other nations the foods which she required at home, and also the raw materials to keep these industries operating so that she could produce these manufactured goods for export.

The importance of the textile industry to Japan cannot be overestimated. It accounts today for over 60 percent of the industrial capacity of the entire nation. Yet today, Japan has only 2,000,000 cotton textile spindles operating as against 12,000,000 in 1937. Today there are 203,000 laborers employed in her cotton textile industry. By a process of simple arithmetic it is easy to see that with 12,000,000 spindles—the capacity of the cotton textile industry in 1937—about six times as many people could be employed, or about 1,200,000.

The industrial rehabilitation of Japan is and has been a primary concern of the occupation authorities. Until self-sufficiency is obtained, Japan and other occupied areas will continue to represent a financial burden which must be sustained by the taxpayers of the United States. Under our international obligation to prevent disease and unrest, we must furnish food and other relief supplies to keep the Japanese people alive. These relief costs, which run to nearly $400,000,000 a year, must be met in addition to the purely military costs of occupation. Consequently, we must face squarely the problem of assisting the Japanese people to become self-supporting. Otherwise we will have to continue relief shipments indefinitely.

One of the principal handicaps which has been faced by occupation authorities in their attempts to bring about economic recovery in occupied areas is the lack of a supply of working capital. This bill will provide the means of obtaining that working capital, and I might say that it has been estimated that savings of $300,000,000 in appropriations for Japanese relief could have been brought about in the past if we had had a revolving fund of this type in operation beginning on VJ-day.

The main reason why this working capital is so important is because Japan and the other occupied countries now have no means of financing purchases of raw materials. These countries are bankrupt; their production is virtually at a standstill; they do not have the purchasing power in the form of exportable commodities with which they can enter foreign markets to buy these raw materials. In Japan, in particular, the textile industry will have to shut down unless working stocks of raw cotton and wool are made available immediately. This will mean more unemployment, more relief shipments, and ultimately more money out of the American taxpayer's pocket.

Considerable progress has been made since the occupation began in the rehabilitation of the Japanese textile industry. This progress has been possible because surplus stocks of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation have been made available. This cotton has been furnished on a credit basis with payment being made from the proceeds of sale of finished goods, in very much the same manner as will be done under the revolving fund. These shipments of cotton provided an interim solution to the problem of obtaining working stocks of raw material—a solution, incidentally, which circumvented for a time the difficulties resulting from the absence of working capital. By now these surplus stocks have been exhausted, and a new method of financing must be provided to finance raw material purchases.

Experience under the CCC program has demonstrated that the Japanese textile industry can and will operate at a profit. Under that program, its average net profits per month have been $10,000,000, and there is every indication that these profits will continue if the textile mills can be assured of working stocks.

Some of the Members may ask if there is not a danger that the textiles produced by the mills of Japan will find their way back to compete with our own textile industry. This fear is absolutely without foundation. Testimony was received from representatives of the cotton textile industry who told the committee that they too had formerly shared this fear. But they went on to say that after careful study of the problem they had come to realize that no question of competition was involved, but rather, the question of survival of the Japanese industry. They pointed out that the products of Japanese mills are of a cheaper quality for which there is no demand in the United States, but for which there is a crying need in India, China, the Philippines, and other countries of the Far East. These were the countries in which Japan sold the bulk of her textile exports before the war. These are the countries from which Japan can obtain copra, rice, and other raw materials vital to her recovery. She can also barter these textiles for rubber and tin which we need in this country, and which can in turn be sold to American purchasers in exchange for dollars with which to repay withdrawals from the revolving fund. I might add that the bill provides that this fund can be terminated at any time by the President or by the Congress, by concurrent resolution. Thus, if Japanese industry ever develops to a point where competition becomes a threat, we can call a halt to this program immediately.

I want to say also that there is no danger that purchases of cotton, wool, mohair, or flax under this fund will raise the domestic prices of these fibers. The quantities of these shipments will be insignificant in comparison with those to be made under the comprehensive foreign-aid programs. Moreover, the fibers to be shipped will be those for which there is no demand in this country—short-staple cotton and cotton waste, wools of coarser grades which now lie unused in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and surplus mohair, of which there are vast stocks still in the hands of domestic producers.

This is a very important bill. It is important from the broad standpoint of our foreign policy. It is important from the standpoint of our taxpayers. It will help materially to put the Japanese economy on a sound basis by restoring her production and by putting her back into normal channels of foreign trade. It is vital from the international political standpoint for the same reason that the foreign-aid programs are so vital. As we all know, there is no better safeguard than prosperity to stem the menacing tide of communism.

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

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

Mr. ELSTON. I have had some persons question whether or not this program might set up a plan which would compete with the textile industry in this country unfairly. Can the gentleman state whether or not it would do that?

Mr. VINSON. That question was raised when the committee was having

its hearings. We have absolute assurance there will be no importations of textiles which will in any way interfere with American production.

The type of goods manufactured by the Japanese does not come in competition with American production. It will be sold out in the Malays, in China, and in that section of the world.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TOWE. Will the gentleman state for the benefit of the House whether or not the cotton and woolen producers as well as the converters in this country favor or disapprove this measure?

Mr. VINSON. The textile people had their representative before the committee. The wool industry had its representative. The type of wool that is used is not a kind that can be used in our looms here and the type of cotton that will be used is the low-grade cotton. So there is no competition and it is urged by the textile industry. They support this bill to aid the industry in Japan to get on its feet, if you please.

This bill will begin to save us money, it will put people back to work and help them rehabilitate themselves, which is the proper thing to do.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say that I have given considerable attention to this matter and I am convinced that in the interest of our country as well as the Japanese it ought to be enacted into law.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to ask members of the committee how this particular program works in connection with Government relief in occupied areas. Does it supplement it, is it in competition with it, or what?

Mr. VINSON. I may say that as the occupied area of Japan is under the jurisdiction of the Army, the administration of this will be by General MacArthur's headquarters.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We are doing just exactly that with some of these millions of dollars we are sending to Germany and Japan. We are using part of it for that purpose.

Mr. VINSON. This will have the effect of reducing that because they will not have to use any of that money for subsistence of the unemployed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Nearly all of this stuff we are sending over there is being sold to those people. There is rolling around somewhere from seven to nine hundred million dollars in a revolving fund to do this very thing the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. VINSON. It is not for this purpose. It may be for some other purpose. It is not for textile purposes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman feels if this program is carried out as now suggested, by this time next year this Congress should be called upon to appropriate less money for these occupied areas?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. If that could have happened immediately after VJ-day we would have saved a great deal of money.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROMOTION OF THE COMMON DEFENSE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2554) to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In enacting this act, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive and continuous program for the future safety and for the defense of the United States by providing adequate measures whereby an essential nucleus of Government-owned industrial plants and a national reserve of machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment may be assured for immediate use to supply the needs of the armed forces in time of national emergency or in anticipation thereof; it is further the intent of the Congress that such Government-owned plants and such reserve shall not exceed in number or kind the minimum requirements for immediate use in time of national emergency, and that any such items which shall become surplus to such requirements shall be disposed of as expeditiously as possible.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) The term "national industrial reserve", as used herein, means that excess industrial property which has been or may hereafter be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of by the United States, subject to a national security clause, and that excess industrial property of the United States which not having been sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of, subject to a national security clause, shall be transferred to the Federal Works Agency under section 5 hereof.

(b) The term "excess industrial property," as used herein, means any machine tool, any industrial manufacturing equipment and any industrial plant (including structures on land owned by or leased to the United States, substantially equipped with machinery, tools, and equipment) which is capable of economic operation as a separate and independent industrial unit and which is not an integral part of an installation of a private contractor, which machine tools, industrial manufacturing equipment, and industrial plants are under the control of any executive department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any wholly owned Government corporation and which are not required for its immediate needs and responsibilities as determined by the head thereof.

(c) The term "national security clause," as used herein, means those terms, conditions, restrictions, and reservations, heretofore formulated or as may be formulated under section 4 (2) hereof for insertion in instruments of sale or lease of property, determined in accordance with section 4 (1) to be a part of the national industrial reserve, which will guarantee the availability of such property for the purposes of national defense at any time when availability thereof for such purposes is deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 4. To effectuate the policy set forth in section 2 of this act the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to—

(1) determine which excess industrial properties should become a part of the national industrial reserve under the provisions of this act;

(2) formulate a national security clause, as defined in section 3 (c) hereof and vary or modify the same from time to time in such manner as best to attain the objectives of this act, having due regard to securing advantageous terms to the Government in the disposal of excess industrial property;

(3) consent to the relinquishment or waiver of all or any part of any national security clause in specific cases when necessary to permit the disposition of particular excess industrial property when it is determined that the retention of the productive capacity of any such excess industrial property is no longer essential to the national security or that the retention of a lesser interest than that originally required will adequately fulfill the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection (3) shall require the modification or waiver of any part of any such national security clause when such clause is deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense to effectuate the purposes of this act; and

(4) designate what excess industrial property shall be disposed of subject to the provisions of the national security clause.

SEC. 5. (a) In the event that any agency charged with the disposal of excess industrial property, after making every practicable effort so to do, is unable to dispose of any excess industrial plant because of the national security clause it shall notify the Secretary of Defense, indicating such modifications in the national security clause, if any, which in its judgment would make possible disposal of the plant. The Secretary of Defense shall consider and agree to any and all such proposed modifications as in his judgment would be consistent with the purposes of this act. If, however, such clause is not modified or the requirements thereof waived pursuant to section 4 (3), or if modified, such plant cannot then be disposed of under such modified clause, the Secretary of Defense shall direct that such plant be transferred to the Federal Works Agency, and such transfer shall be without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any agency charged with the disposal of excess machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment shall transfer custody of such machine tools and equipment as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 4 hereof to the Federal Works Agency, without reimbursement, for storage and maintenance.

SEC. 6. Subject to provisions of section 7 hereof, the Federal Works Agency is hereby

authorized and directed to accept the transfer to it of such excess industrial property as is directed to be transferred to it under section 4 hereof and, as and when directed or authorized by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 7 hereof, to utilize, maintain, protect, repair, restore, renovate, lease, or dispose of such property. Notwithstanding section 321 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 303 (b)), any lease may provide for the renovation, maintenance, protection, repair, and restoration by the lessee, of the property leased, or of the entire unit or installation when a substantial part thereof is leased, as part or all of the consideration for the lease of such property.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Defense, with respect to property in the national industrial reserve, is authorized when he deems such action to be in the interest of national security—

(1) to establish general policies for the care, maintenance, utilization, recording, and security of such property transferred to the Federal Works Agency pursuant to section 5 hereof; and

(2) to direct the transfer without reimbursement by the Federal Works Agency of any of such property to other Government agencies with the consent of such agencies; and

(3) to direct the leasing by the Federal Works Agency of any of such property to designated lessees; and

(4) to authorize the disposition by the Federal Works Agency of any such property by sale or otherwise when in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense such property may be disposed of subject to or free of the national security clause provided for in section 5 hereof; and

(5) to authorize and regulate the lending of any such property by the Federal Works Agency to any nonprofit educational institution or training school when (a) the Secretary shall determine that the program proposed by such institution or school for the use of such property will contribute materially to national defense, and (b) such institution or school shall by agreement make such provision as the Secretary shall deem satisfactory for the proper maintenance of such property and for its return to the Federal Works Agency without expense to the Government.

SEC. 8. As and when directed or authorized by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to the provisions of section 7 hereof, the Federal Works Agency shall after the date upon which transfer is directed pursuant to section 5 hereof provide for the transportation, handling, care, storage, protection, maintenance, utilization, repair, restoration, renovation, leasing, and disposition of excess industrial property.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of any property for the national industrial reserve except from excess or surplus Government-owned property.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of Defense shall appoint a National Industrial Reserve Review Committee, which shall consist of not exceeding 15 persons to be appointed from civilian life who are by training and experience familiar with various fields of American industry, including shipbuilding, aircraft manufacture, machine tools, and arms and armament production. The members of such committee shall serve for such term or terms as the Secretary of Defense may specify and shall meet at such times as may be specified by the Secretary of Defense to consult with and advise the National Military Establishment. Each member of such committee shall be entitled to compensation in the amount of $50 for each day, or part of day, he shall be in attendance at any regular called meeting of the committee, together with reimbursement for all travel expenses incident to such attendance: *Provided*, That nothing contained in sections 41, 109, and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 93, 198, and 203); in Revised Statutes, section 190 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99); in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (Public Law 395, Seventy-eighth Congress); or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply to such persons solely by reason of their appointment to and membership on such committee.

SEC. 11. It shall be the duty of the committee appointed under section 10 hereof to review not less often than once each year the justification for the retention of property in the national industrial reserve established hereunder and (i) to recommend to the Secretary of Defense the disposition of any such property which in the opinion of the committee would no longer be of sufficient strategic value to warrant its further retention for the production of war material in the event of a national emergency; (ii) to recommend to the Secretary of Defense standards of maintenance for the property held in the national industrial reserve; (iii) to review and recommend to the Secretary of Defense the disposal of that property which in the opinion of the committee could and should be devoted to commercial use in the civilian economy; and (iv) to advise the Secretary of Defense with respect to such activities under this Act as he may request.

SEC. 12. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress on April 1 of each year a report detailing the action taken by it hereunder and containing such other pertinent information on the status of the national industrial reserve as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the need for amendments and related legislation.

SEC. 13. Section 5 of the act approved August 5, 1947 (ch. 493, 61 Stat. 774), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Secretary of Defense and to the Federal Works Administration, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Congress may, from time to time, determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary of Defense and the Federal Works Agency to carry out their respective functions under the act.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, S. 2554 is a bill to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity. It is almost identical to a House bill, H. R. 6098, which has been unanimously reported to the House by the Armed Services Committee.

This is one of the most important defense measures to be presented to the Congress in this session. This bill, if passed, will preserve an essential nucleus of industrial plants and manufacturing equipment so necessary to the Nation in the event of an emergency.

The primary purpose of this bill is to establish a method of maintaining plants which cannot be disposed of subject to a national-security clause. This bill provides that after a disposal agency finds that it cannot dispose of any excess industrial plant with the national-security clause, then the Secretary of Defense may direct that such plant be transferred to the Federal Works Agency without reimbursement. Thereafter the Federal Works Agency, subject to the policy and standards established by the Secretary of Defense, shall maintain the plants and equipment in adequate standby condition so as to insure their readiness for use in the event of an emergency. It is contemplated that the Federal Works Agency would be authorized to utilize such facilities for storage purposes or other Government use, which would not affect the basic functions of the plant. Continuing efforts will be made to sell or lease these plants with appropriate security clauses imposed.

Under the provisions of Public Law 364, approximately 100,000 machine tools have been earmarked for the industrial reserve or transferred to the custody of the armed services. The proposed legislation permits the further selection of machine tools and industrial equipment excess to the needs of any Government department to be placed in the industrial reserve. It is estimated that the total industrial reserve of machine tools and equipment may eventually approximate 150,000 to 200,000 items.

It is anticipated that under the proposed legislation, the Federal Works Agency will be called upon to maintain about 60 industrial plants. These plants originally cost about $550,000,000. It will cost about 5 percent of original cost to place these plants in adequate stand-by condition, and thereafter about 1 percent per year for maintenance.

The entire cost of the project for fiscal 1949 will probably be about $36,000,000, and thereafter about $6,000,000 to $7,000,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize the importance of this legislation from a national defense viewpoint. In effect, all we are doing is keeping what we have so that if we are ever called upon to produce war material, we will not have to spend billions for rebuilding or repurchasing that which we already have.

This bill does not in any way impair the operations of private industry or the national economy, and I sincerely hope it will be accepted by the House.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 6098) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Chester O. Glenn;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2696. An act for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4516. An act for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6698. An act 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;

H. R. 6813. An act to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting;

H. R. 6360. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry;

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1691. An act for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.;

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building;

S. 2849. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.; and

S. 2861. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) entitled "An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, 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. REED, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CORDON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MCKELLAR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6428. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6501) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in the interest of national security the Federal Government should promote the employment in air commerce in as large numbers as possible of more efficient transport and cargo aircraft; and, to this end, sponsor the design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototype transport and cargo aircraft, intended primarily for commercial use, but adaptable also for auxiliary military service.

SEC. 2. The Civil Transport Aircraft Evaluation and Development Board (referred to hereinafter as "the Board") hereinafter provided for, is authorized and directed—

(a) to survey the national requirements for aircraft types designed primarily for commercial transport and cargo service, but adaptable also as auxiliary military transport for one or more of the departments of the National Military Establishment;

(b) to prepare and recommend, from time to time, the operating and utility characteristics and specifications of such aircraft: *Provided*, That such characteristics and specifications shall be consistent with the requirements of the civil air regulations promulgated by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

(c) to advise the Secretary of the Air Force (referred to hereinafter as "the Secretary") of the Board's findings and recommendations under this section, and to recommend the allotment by the Secretary, from funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, of appropriate sums for design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototypes of each such type of aircraft.

SEC. 3. (a) The Board shall be composed of one representative designated by each of the following agencies: The United States Air Force, the United States Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and such other agencies of the Federal Government, concerned with aeronautics, as the Board may, from time to time, determine.

(b) To assist the Board in carrying out its functions, it is authorized to establish an industrial advisory committee composed of not less than six members appointed by the Board with the approval of the Secretary. Each member of such committee shall serve for a term of 2 years, except that (1) the terms of three of the members first taking office after the enactment of this act shall expire at the end of 1 year, and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds. No member shall be eligible to serve continuously for more than one term unless in the opinion of the Board his reappointment is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act. Members of such committee may be designated without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall receive such compensation, not in excess of $50 for each day or part of a day actually devoted to the performance of the duties of such committee, as the Board shall determine. Each member of such committee shall be allowed actual necessary transportation expenses and an allowance not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence when engaged in the performance of the duties of such committee at any place other than his permanent residence or place of business. Nothing contained in sections 41, 109, 112, or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 93, 198, 202, and 203), section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119), or any other provision of law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply to any such person solely by reason of membership on such committee: *Provided*, That the provisions of the act of July 12, 1870 (R. S. 3679; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 665), as amended, shall not apply to the acceptance of voluntary service by any member of any such committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Board shall be designated by the Secretary from among the members thereof and the Board shall act in accordance with such regulations and rules of procedure as it may, from time to time, prescribe. The Board is authorized and directed to consult with manufacturers of aircraft, and with United States operators of transport aircraft. Members of the Board shall serve as such without additional compensation, but each member of the Board shall be allowed actual necessary transportation expenses and an allowance not to exceed $10 per diem, in lieu of subsistence, when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Board at any place other than his permanent station.

(d) The Board and the Secretary are authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but without regard to any provision of law limiting the number of civilian personnel which may be employed by the Department of the Air Force, to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be deemed necessary to assist the Board and the Secretary in carrying out their respective functions under this act: *Provided*, That to the extent possible, consistent with other duties and assignments, the personnel and facilities of the member agencies of the Board shall be used to carry out the duties of the Board.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized and directed, if he concurs in the advice and recommendations of the Board referred to in section 2 of this act, to provide, out of funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, for the design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototypes of each such type

of aircraft, by contract or otherwise. Any such contract entered into by the Government shall contain a provision that—

(1) sales of aircraft subsequently manufactured from the design specifications of such prototype or prototypes shall be made at a price allowing a reasonable profit, not exceeding such profit as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and

(2) in determining the fair selling price of such aircraft, except to the extent required by the Secretary, there shall not be included in the cost thereof any development, engineering, tooling, or other costs which have been reimbursed to the manufacturer by the Secretary; and

(3) aircraft subsequently manufactured from the design specifications of such prototype or prototypes shall be sold only to purchasers who, by contract with the Secretary, have undertaken (a) unless required by the civil air regulations to make no changes in the design or standard equipment of such aircraft without first obtaining the approval of the Secretary; and (b) to make, for an agreed sum payable by the Secretary, such changes in the design or standard equipment of such aircraft, not inconsistent with the civil air regulations, as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of section 4 of this act, may enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, with or without legal consideration, with or without performance or other bonds, and, in carrying out such contracts, arrangements, or modifications thereof, may make advance, progress, and other payments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Each contract, arrangement, or modification thereof, executed pursuant to this act, shall contain such provisions, consistent with the laws affecting the issuance or use of patents, governing the disposition and use of inventions made thereunder as are appropriate, in the judgment of the Secretary, to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract, arrangement, or modification thereof is executed.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to procure and test prototype aircraft from any manufacturer whose design meets the operating and utility characteristics and specifications recommended by the Board: *Provided*, That, in the event such manufacturer is not in a position to produce promptly the prototype aircraft desired, then the Secretary may procure such prototype aircraft from any other qualified manufacturer.

SEC. 7. Aircraft manufactured from design specifications pursuant to this act shall not be sold directly or by resale to either foreign governments or other foreign users without the approval of the Secretary: *Provided*, That in approving any such sale the Secretary may waive such of the requirements of section 3 hereof as he may deem proper.

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized and directed, if he concurs in the advice and recommendations of the Board with respect thereto, by appropriate contractual conditions or otherwise, to recover, in whole or in part, as deemed to be practicable and expedient, the costs incurred by the United States pursuant to this act. The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress within a period of 1 year following the passage of this act a report setting forth the means and methods which he intends to utilize in effecting such recovery.

SEC. 9. In the event the Board shall recommend the development of a seaplane commercial transport or cargo aircraft and the Secretaries of the Navy and the Air Force concur, the Secretary of the Navy shall be authorized to perform all of the functions with respect to such aircraft as are vested in the Secretary of the Air Force by this act, and the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy such funds appropriated under this act as may be necessary for the performance of such functions.

SEC. 10. As used in this act—

(a) The term "aircraft" shall include engines, propellers, instruments, accessories, and standard equipment for such aircraft.

(b) The term "standard equipment" means all operational features of such aircraft, including, without limitation, standard cockpit arrangement, communications, facilities, and provisions for such items, but excluding commercial equipment.

(c) The term "commercial equipment" means removable furnishings and fittings, not part of the primary structure or the mechanical apparatus of such aircraft, and which is generally installed for the accommodation of passengers, baggage, or cargo.

(d) The term "prototype aircraft" means the initial models of each type, built primarily for static tests, flight performance, and service test.

SEC. 11. The Secretary and the Board shall transmit to the Congress, on the 1st day of January in each year, a report on (1) the progress made in the accomplishment of the purposes of this act and (2) the amounts of the expenditures made or obligated pursuant thereto.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Air Force such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, this bill has received the unanimous approval of all Members of the Committee on Armed Services who were present and who took part in the consideration of it, as well as of those to whose attention it has been brought. It sets forth the policy of the United States that in the interest of national security the Federal Government should promote the employment in air commerce of as large numbers as possible of more efficient transport and cargo aircraft. The purpose of the bill, which has the approval of the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of the Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the Civil Aeronautics Board is to see to it that the latest possible transport designs are available for air-commercial people. At the outbreak of the present war the Government was fortunate and so was the military in having DC–3 planes available in large numbers. The cargo companies are not in a position to develop the new planes, and that being so it is believed that the Air Forces, under the direction of the Secretary and Board, should determine the best type of transport plane for both the military and the commercial people and to see, if possible, if they cannot agree to use that plane in their operations. That, I think, is a sufficient explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. DONDERO submitted conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

CONVEYING SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CLASON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 3735:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, 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 disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey, subject to the limitations and conditions hereinafter enumerated and such others as he may prescribe, to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, for recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all or any part of that portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, extending one mile east from Brooks Bridge on United States Highway 98 near the town of Fort Walton, Florida, except for a strip of land six hundred feet wide (three hundred feet east and three hundred feet west from center line of road leading to radar site 'Dick'), extending from Highway 98 to the mean low water level of the Gulf of Mexico, and two miles west from said bridge, and to all or any part of that portion of said Santa Rosa Island which lies east of the new channel at East Pass (consisting of two small islands), said property being under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. Such conveyance shall be made upon payment by said county of a sum which shall be 50 per centum of the fair value of the property conveyed, based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for sale regardless of its former character or use, as determined by the Secretary, less such portion of the price originally paid by said county for said island, prior to its conveyance to the United States, as the Secretary shall determine to be fair and equitable."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHARLES R. CLASON,
CHAS. H. ELSTON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
HARRY FLOOD 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 Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) entitled "An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit the Secretary of the Army to convey a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., to Okaloosa County, Fla., subject to restrictions, without consideration, for public recreational purposes. The Senate disagreed with the provisions authorizing a gratuitous conveyance of the property in question and amended the bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall be permitted to convey the property to Okaloosa County, Fla., but that the consideration for such conveyance should be equal to the fair value of the property conveyed, based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for sale without regard to its former character or use, less such portion of the price originally paid by said county for said land, prior to its conveyance to the United States. The conferees have agreed to an amendment to the Senate amendment wherein the conveyance is authorized upon the payment of 50 percent of the fair market value of the property by Okaloosa County, Fla., to the United States.

Senate amendment No. 2 is merely a clarifying amendment which clearly defines the responsibility, as between Okaloosa County and the Department of the Army, for the maintenance of certain fences which are to be erected pursuant to the provisions of the proposed legislation. Senate amendments Nos. 3 and 4 are only technical amendments which are made necessary by the fact that the Secretary of War has been superseded by the Secretary of the Army.

CHARLES R. CLASON,
CHAS. H. ELSTON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 654) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 318 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, continued by House Resolution 153 of the Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $10,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 213) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,500 copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee during current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 676) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 293, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $5,000 additional, including the expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, special counsel, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committtee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATIONS OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 674) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the studies and investigations conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 404, Eightieth Congress, not to exceed $10,000 additional, including the expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 655) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the fifteenth report of the Commission of Fine Arts, transmitted by the President to the Congress of the United States on May 27, 1948, be printed as a House document with illustrations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 675) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the Joint Committee on Housing (established by H. Con. Res. 104, Eightieth Congress), for the purpose of concluding its business not to exceed $5,000 including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants since May 15, 1948, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers signed by the former chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF PRAYERS OFFERED BY THE CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 646) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 2,500 copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, Chaplain of the House, at the opening of the daily sessions of the House, during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, including the current session, be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

After the comma on page 1, line 3, insert the following: "and any acting Chaplain of the House,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 595) to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to recommend a national fuel policy.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. BUCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have an explanation of this resolution?

Mr. RIZLEY. This resolution came from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It gives that committee authority to look into the fuel situation during this summer. It was reported by that committee unanimously

and was reported out of the Committee on Rules unanimously.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas it appears that current and anticipated shortages of petroleum products threaten the present and future economy and security of the people of the United States; and

Whereas such shortages must be considered in the light of the availability of other fuels and energy resources; and

Whereas in order to deal effectively with the problem of making petroleum and other fuels available in quantities adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, it is necessary to formulate sound national policies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it shall be the duty of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to formulate and recommend a national fuel policy adequate to meet the needs of the United States in times of peace and war, including recommendations for a national petroleum policy and the integration of such policy with policies relating to other fuels and energy resources except atomic energy; and for such purposes the committee shall study the current and future fuel supply and demand of the United States and shall study methods of encouraging needed developments to assure the availability of fuels adequate for an expanding economy and the security of the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a report not later than the close of the present Congress. Such report may be made to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof—

(1) is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has adjourned, or has recessed, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary; and subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member;

(2) may utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies;

(3) may seek information from such sources and conduct its studies and investigations in such manner as it deems advisable in the interest of a full and correct ascertainment of the facts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 600) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of carrying out the provisions of House Resolution 595, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $35,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, assistants, and other employees, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 4, strike out "$35,000" and insert "$20,000" in lieu thereof.

Line 11, following the word "subcommittee," add the words "and approved by the Committee on House Administration."

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have no way of objecting to these appropriations, of course, since they come from the Committee on House Administration as privileged matters. But just the other day, before several resolutions similar to this passed, I looked up the record with reference to such appropriations. I find that this Congress has already appropriated $1,733,741.52 for investigating committees. I think that that is probably a larger amount than I have ever known to be appropriated in any 10-year period for investigating committees.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Of course, the gentleman knows that a considerable part of that money has not yet been expended. For example, the resolution just read was reduced from $35,000 to $20,000, in accordance with the resolution which was just passed a moment ago.

Mr. RAYBURN. I understand that, but by the time we get through with this session of the Congress, we will probably have appropriated much more than $2,000,000 to pay the expenses of investigating committees. Nearly half of the amount that has been appropriated, the gentleman understands, has not been expended.

I do not say that all this money has been expended, but it has been appropriated.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I do not have the figures with me as to amount that is unexpended. But some of the committees, for example, have already turned back money.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that all this money has been expended. I am just saying that this session of the Congress has appropriated $1,733,741.52 for investigating committees.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to remind the gentleman from Texas that under the Reorganization Act, the responsibility was placed on the regular standing committees of the Congress to conduct continuing surveillance of the operations coming within their jurisdiction. Much of the money has been spent in that way. I might suggest also that my view is that probably the money that has been spent that way is the best money that this Congress has ever spent.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF ISLAND POSSESSIONS IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 129) providing for a joint committee composed of Members of the Senate and the House Public Lands Committee to make an investigation of our island possessions in the Pacific and trust territories, and report back recommendations for legislation providing for civil government, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 11, after "advisable.", insert: "The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words."

Page 4, line 12, after "committee", insert: ", which shall not exceed $50,000,".

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is that for the trip down to the Hawaiian Islands to investigate whether that Territory is ready for statehood?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No. This bill passed the House and has already passed the Senate. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. This in no way refers to the Hawaiian Islands statehood proposition.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of curiosity, we passed the Hawaiian Islands statehood bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Unfortunately, it was not passed in the other body.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I suppose under this resolution the joint committee will keep alive the hope to the people of Hawaii that sometime in the future both branches will act favorably.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I appreciate the gentleman making those remarks, but this resolution has to do with a trusteed area which has been taken over under the United Nations by the United States, and we must necessarily adopt some kind of civil form of government.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not opposed to the resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. I make the observation that certainly this body did everything it could in connection with Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right.

Mr. HOBBS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the distinguished gentleman from Michigan if he is a member of that committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You mean the committee that is to be appointed?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs and Territories, I may be on the committee, but the Speaker has not yet appointed a committee.

Mr. HOBBS. But you are chairman of the committee which is bringing in this request?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. HOBBS. And, in your opinion, it is all right?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. HOBBS. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to promote the general welfare of the inhabitants of the Virgin Islands of the United States through the economic development of the Virgin Islands of the United States there is hereby created, within the Department of the Interior, a body corporate to be known as the Virgin Islands Corporation hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation."

SEC. 2. The Corporation shall have principal offices in the Virgin Islands and in the District of Columbia and shall be deemed, for purposes of venue in civil actions to be an inhabitant of each of these jurisdictions. The Corporation may establish offices in such other place or places as it may deem necessary or appropriate in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 3. The Corporation shall have, and may exercise, the following general powers, in addition to those elsewhere conferred in this act:

(a) To have succession until dissolved by act of Congress.

(b) To adopt, alter, and use a seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) To adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws governing the conduct of its general business, and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law.

(d) To sue and to be sued in its corporate name.

(e) To determine through its directors the character of and necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to laws applicable generally to Government corporations.

(f) To execute all instruments necessary or appropriate in the exercise of any of its powers.

(g) Whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of the Corporation, to acquire, in any lawful manner, any property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible; to hold, maintain, use, and operate the same; and to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of the same.

(h) When consistent with the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law, to enter into contracts, leases, agreements, or other transactions—

(1) with any person, firm, association, or corporation; and

(2) with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State, Territory, or possession, or with any political subdivision thereof, on a break-even basis, except that such basis shall not apply with respect to the sale of products manufactured or produced by the Corporation: *Provided*, That in no case shall the Corporation contract to undertake an activity for any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State, Territory, or possession, or with any political subdivision thereof, unless the latter is authorized by law to undertake such activity and has funds available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall not undertake any program or activity tending to duplicate concurrently the programs or activities of any other Government agency within the Virgin Islands or extend such program or activity beyond limitations already imposed on such other governmental agencies.

(i) To obtain funds from the Treasury of the United States, for use in the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law, not to exceed a total of $7,775,000 outstanding at any time. For this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to advance to the Corporation out of funds appropriated in advance to the Treasury for this purpose, amounts not exceeding a total of $7,775,000 when requested by the Board of Directors of the Corporation. Appropriations for this purpose are hereby authorized to be made.

(j) To appoint such officers, agents, and employees; to vest them with such powers and duties; to fix and pay such compensation to them for their services as the Corporation may determine, without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and to require bonds for the faithful performance of their duties, the premiums on such bonds to be paid by the Corporation: *Provided*, That persons employed by the Corporation whose compensation is paid on any basis other than a per annum basis shall not be included in making computations pursuant to the provisions of section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall give due consideration to residents of the Virgin Islands in the hiring of its employees and officers.

(k) To use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(l) To have, in the payment of debts out of bankruptcy estates, the priority of the United States.

(m) To accept gifts or donations of services, or of property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, in aid of any of the purposes herein authorized.

(n) To take such actions as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers herein or hereafter specifically conferred upon it.

SEC. 4. In fulfillment of its objects, the Corporation, in accordance with annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to applicable provisions of law, is authorized to use its general powers—

(a) to examine, investigate, and conduct research and experimentation in the marketing, distributing, advertising, and exporting of products or resources of the Virgin Islands, and to make known the results of such activities;

(b) to encourage and to promote the investment of private capital in industrial, agricultural, commercial, or related enterprises or activities in the Virgin Islands. Insofar as may be possible without jeopardizing the maximum development of industrial, agricultural, commercial, and related resources for the public good, the Corporation shall formulate its policies so as to encourage and promote the investment of capital owned by residents of the Virgin Islands;

(c) to engage in land-use planning to the end that the most economic and socially beneficial use may be made of the soil of the Virgin Islands, and to encourage and assist private persons and organizations to act in accordance with the results of such planning;

(d) to encourage and engage in the business of providing, whenever adequate facilities are not otherwise available, transportation for persons and property to and from the Virgin Islands, and from place to place in the Virgin Islands;

(e) to encourage, promote, and develop, and to assist in the encouragement, promotion, and development of tourist trade in the Virgin Islands;

(f) to encourage the establishment and development of small farms and small farm communities in the Virgin Islands, and, for that purpose, to construct, equip, improve, administer, operate, and supervise such small farms or communities and to make loans and give other assistance to them;

(g) to make loans to any person for the establishment, maintenance, operation, construction, reconstruction, repair, improvement, or enlargement of any industrial, commercial, agricultural, or related enterprise, undertaking, or activity in the Virgin Islands whenever such loans are not available from private sources: *Provided*, That the total amount of outstanding loans made under authority of this paragraph shall not at any time exceed $5,221,880: *Provided further*, That each person applying for a loan shall be required to furnish adequate security and that the interest on such loans shall not exceed 6 percent per annum; shall be the general policy of the Corporation to establish interest rates on loans that, in the judgment of the Board of Directors, will at least cover the interest cost of funds to the United States Treasury, the operating expenses of the lending division of the corporation, and a risk factor which, over all, should provide for losses that may be expected to materialize on loans;

(h) for any of the purposes or objects herein authorized, and for the further purpose of developing the industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, livestock, fishery, and forestry resources of the Virgin Islands, to establish, maintain, operate, and engage in, upon its own account, any appropriate enterprise, undertaking, or activity:

Provided, That the Corporation shall not undertake any activity not specifically set forth in the annual budget programs: *Provided further*, That in the event an emergency is declared to exist by the Board of Directors during a period when the Congress is not in session, appropriate action in effectuation of the policies or purposes of the Corporation recommended by the Board to meet such emergency may be taken upon the advance authorization of the President of the United States. Such emergency action shall be reported to the Congress upon its reconvening for its approval, and, subject to the appropriation of funds therefore, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to reimburse the Corporation for any losses incurred as a result of such action.

SEC. 5. (a) The Corporation shall issue a receipt as of July 1, 1948, to the Secretary

of the Treasury for the value of the property and assets transferred, less the liabilities assumed, under section 9 hereof. Such receipt shall be evidence of the ownership of the Corporation by the United States of America. The amount of the receipt shall be increased or decreased by any subsequent changes in the investment of the United States Government. Any property and assets, the ownership of which hereafter may be transferred to the Corporation without cost, or for consideration clearly not commensurate with the value received, shall be included in the investment of the United States Government at net values approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Any income earned by the Corporation shall be included in the investment and any losses incurred shall reduce the investment. The amount of the receipt shall not include, and interest shall not be paid to the Treasury on funds advanced by or payable to other agencies of the United States Government.

(b) The Corporation shall pay interest on the advances from the Treasury and on that part of the Government's investment represented by assets transferred to the Corporation, but shall not pay interest on accumulated net income or on funds received through appropriations by the Congress to cover losses. The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the interest rate annually in advance; such rate to be calculated to reimburse the Treasury for its cost.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury sums to cover net losses estimated in advance in the Corporation's budgets submitted in accordance with the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597) and approved by the Congress, to be paid over to the Corporation from time to time as needed.

SEC. 6. The Corporation is hereby authorized to use all its funds and other assets, and all funds and other assets which may hereafter be paid, transferred, or allocated to, or otherwise acquired by it in the exercise of its corporate powers and functions: *Provided*, That no Government funds may be turned over to or administered by the Corporation other than as authorized by this act or the annual Government Corporations Appropriation Acts. The Corporation shall reimburse the civil-service retirement and disability fund for Government contributions to the fund applicable to the Corporation's employees, and the employees' compensation fund, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, for the benefit payments made to the Corporation's employees, and shall also reimburse other Government agencies for payments of a similar nature made on behalf of the Corporation.

SEC. 7. The Corporation shall pay into the Treasury of the United States the amount of its funds, from whatever source derived, in excess of the current requirements of the Corporation. Such payments shall be applied, first to reduce the balance of the receipt evidencing ownership attributable to advances outstanding under section 3 (i) hereof, after which any payments shall be applied to the remainder of the receipt. The investment of the United States Government in no event shall be reduced to less than $1.

SEC. 8. The property and business of the Corporation shall be managed by a board of mine directors to consist of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Secretary of the Interior or his nominee, the president of the Corporation, the remaining members to be appointed by the President of the United States. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. Not more than five directors shall be of any one political party. The directors shall designate one of their members as chairman of the Board, subject to the approval of the President of the United States. The Board of Directors shall report upon the affairs and activities of the Corporation to the President of the United States through the Secretary of the Interior. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of 5 years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as possible each year. The Board shall meet at least quarterly: *Provided*, That at least two of the meetings in each year shall be held in the Virgin Islands. Directors who are otherwise employed full time by the Corporation, by the Government of the Virgin Islands, by the municipalities of St. Thomas and St. John or St. Croix, or by the United States Government shall not receive additional compensation for their services as directors. All other directors shall receive a fee of $50 a day for each day in attendance at directors' meetings, including travel time. All directors shall receive necessary travel expenses in connection with their attendance at directors' meetings. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. Qualifications for Board membership shall consist of demonstrated ability, attachment to the public interest, impartiality, and diversified experience among the members. The Board shall confine itself to over-all policy-making, directive, and supervisory functions with administrative functions centered in a staff of executive officers (including a controller) headed by a chief executive, resposible for the execution of programs and policies adopted by the Board.

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby transferred to the Corporation the following property:

(1) All property—real, personal, and mixed—now operated by the Virgin Islands Company, on behalf of the United States, except that property now operated by the company for the Department of the Interior conveyed to that Department by revocable permit from the Navy Department under agreement dated January 1, 1948. The value of the property so transferred shall be fixed at the depreciated cost as of June 30, 1947, shown in schedule 1 of the Comptroller General's report on the audit of the Virgin Islands Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, adjusted for all changes from that date to the date of transfer, including depreciation at rates set forth in said schedule 1.

(2) All the assets and property—real, personal, and mixed, tangible and intangible—of the Virgin Islands Company. The value of the property so transferred shall be fixed at the value shown on the books of the Virgin Islands Company at the date of transfer, subject to any adjustment deemed necessary as a result of the audit required to be made by the Comptroller General under section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945.

(3) All of the United States Government's interest in the property known as Bluebeard Castle Hotel situated in the Island of St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands of the United States. The value of the property so transferred shall be fixed at a value approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(b) The Corporation shall assume and discharge all of the liabilities of the Virgin Islands Company: *Provided*, That the liabilities shall not include the balances of relief grants held by the Virgin Islands Company, which balances are invested in the assets and property embraced by section 9 (a) (2) hereof, and which shall become part of the Government's investment in the Corporation.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Interior, the Under Secretary of the Interior, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, who are the stockholders of the Virgin Islands Company, a corporation created by ordinance of the Colonial Council for St. Thomas and St. John, Virgin Islands of the United States, are hereby authorized and directed to take such steps as may be appropriate to dissolve the said Virgin Islands Company.

SEC. 11. In lieu of taxes, the Corporation is authorized to make the annual payments into the municipal treasuries of the Virgin Islands directed by section 5 of the act of May 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1372; 48 U. S. C. 1401d), to be made by the Virgin Islands Company: *Provided*, That any valuation for tax purposes made by the Secretary of the Interior shall not be reviewable by any court: *Provided further*, That the annual payments shall not include payments in lieu of income taxes, capital stock taxes, or franchise taxes.

SEC. 12. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 is amended by striking out "The Virgin Islands Company" appearing therein and substituting "the Virgin Islands Corporation."

SEC. 13. This act shall become effective June 30, 1948.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "Virgin Islands Corporation Act."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, some 14 years ago, as the result of a terrific and chaotic economic condition in the Virgin Islands, the Government of the United States went into that Territory and established what has been known for the past 14 years as the Virgin Islands Company. Private citizens of that area had practically been thrown into bankruptcy and were forced to discontinue operation of their plantations and their sugar mills because of the terrific losses that had been incurred in the period 1929 to 1933. The Government of the United States outside of the Virgin Islands Company and through the Department of the Interior, Public Works Division, acquired a very substantial acreage where sugarcane and other crops had previously been grown. They purchased two sugar mills and a rum factory which had been owned and operated by private individuals. The Virgin Islands Company, having received grants-in-aid from the Treasury of the United States, leased from the Department of the Interior, Public Works Division, lands and mills which the Department of the Interior had acquired.

During the past 14 years the Virgin Islands Company has been operating those properties under lease. The Virgin Islands Company is the largest employer of direct employees, and, indirectly, through purchasing the products grown by farmers on the island of St. Croix, which is the largest agricultural area of the islands, and thereby becomes the largest employer of people in the Virgin Islands. Its operations primarily constitute the backbone of the economic structure of the Virgin Islands.

Some months ago, as you know, the Congress of the United States adopted the Federal Corporations Act which forces all of these Federal corporations to become organized under the Corporations Act. It is therefore necessary now to reincorporate the Virgin Islands Company before the 30th of June of this year under the new Federal Corporations Act or the Virgin Islands Company must go out of business not later than June 30 of this year.

If the Virgin Islands Company does go out of business on June 30 of this year it forces a tremendous relief program to be initiated by the Government of the United States in order to provide relief for the people of the Virgin Islands because the principal industrial operation of the Virgin Islands will cease to operate.

The best information which I can obtain, and it is certainly reliable, from the Department of the Interior, the Governor and the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. Croix, is that this will call for an immediate job for the Red Cross and cost millions of dollars from the Federal Treasury putting these people on direct relief if these operations, agricultural and industrial, are discontinued. This is a straight proposition without any vacillation whatsoever to refinance the Virgin Islands Company, extend it under the New Federal Corporations Act and let it go along as a direct employer maintaining the principal economic structure of the Virgin Islands.

We are now at the point where we must make a decision whether or not we shall resort to direct relief in place of agricultural and industrial operations or go ahead with the refinancing and reconstruction of the Virgin Islands Company under the new Corporations Act.

If any Member desires to ask questions, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman tell us what the over-all cost involved in this bill will be?

Mr. CRAWFORD. This bill calls for only $7,750,000 for the combined purpose. Now, let me make this very emphatic: It will take something like $900,000 to refinance the Company and rebuild the mills so that they can operate efficiently, and put in new machinery—new presses for the sugarcane which the farmers grow.

This bill carries, roughly, $4,000,000 as part of the $7,750,000 for the Company to use in making loans to people in the Virgin Islands who are without bank facilities in that the one bank located there which holds the position of a virtual monopoly will not extend commercial loans to the people and let them adventure in their own way. This is necessary if the people of the Virgin Islands are to have money with which to operate or a source from which to get funds so that they can enter into private industry of their own. They must have recourse to the RFC, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or some other Government credit agency, in the absence of the existence of the Virgin Islands Company.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman know what action the other body took on this?

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand, the other body has passed a bill which provides only $500,000 to continue the operation of this Company along with loans that it will have to obtain from the Treasury of the United States for 1 year.

That bring up this question: Just 1 year ago in the closing hours of the session, as a matter of fact, almost at midnight, as the result of our not having acted prior to that time, the Appropriations Committees of the two bodies in conjunction with my efforts and the efforts of other gentlemen of the Congress, mushed through in the last minutes a life rope, you might say, and pulled the Company through, but with the promises that before this time this whole matter would be cleaned up. Now we face the situation where the other body offers to extend it on a shoestring basis for another 6 months until the Congress meets in January, action which will call for an amendment to the Federal Corporations Act exempting this corporation from that act so that it may continue beyond June 30. That is as frank and blunt as I can state with reference to what the other body has done.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel the action of the other body is probably better than this bill?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think so. I feel that the responsibility of the Virgin Islands is upon the leadership of these two bodies and that we have not treated those people fairly. It is time for us to give them some answer as to their social and economic condition while we are doing all these things for people scattered all over the world.

This is a bill that I strongly urge and strongly advocate for the favorable consideration of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman tell the House whether the Virgin Islands Company has done anything in the way of rehabilitating those people?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Virgin Islands Company has maintained the social and economic structure of these people during the past 14 years and it has charged up against that a loss of only about $60,000 in direct losses plus depreciation on the agricultural implements and the factory owned by the Department of the Interior during that period.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress ought to be informed as to what is going on in the Virgin Islands. Senator BUTLER and myself made a trip to the Virgin Islands during the Christmas holidays. We spent 2 weeks in these islands. A report was made to Congress. It is amazing the amount of waste of the taxpayers' money that is going on in the islands.

You must remember the Seventy-eighth Congress appropriated $10,000,000 for a rehabilitation program, a public-works program, in the Virgin Islands. We have already spent more than $4,000,000 on public works.

Mr. Speaker, I was down there and saw some of those public works. In two of the towns on St. Croix Island, Christiansted and Fredriksted, they had built 3 miles of sewers and have 18 private houses connected with those sewers.

They are wasting the taxpayers' money in a way I am sure you would not approve.

As to the Virgin Islands Company, we looked into that very, very carefully. The present manager I think is a good man. His name is Olsen. He wants to get out of the business of growing sugarcane by those people. He has the earmarks of a good manager. Now, we propose to appropriate over $7,000,000 to continue this Company. Between four and five hundred people are employed by the Virgin Islands Company for a period of about 5 months in the year.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman knows very well that the pay roll of the Virgin Islands Company to which the gentleman refers does not include the very small farmer who operates a small piece of land and sells the products of his labor to the mills operated by the Virgin Islands Company and the gentleman further knows that the $10,000,000 referred to by him has nothing whatever to do with the Virgin Islands Company.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It was a work-relief project. I know there are a few small farmers around there who raise cane and send it to the mills. The sugarcane industry cannot be justified,

The Government is also in the rum business. You have to sort of give it away with the other liquor that people drink. They have to buy some of this Government rum in order to get liquor. Now, that molasses is brought over from Puerto Rico.

I admit that the Virgin Islands is our problem. The people have not been very well treated. But I am also here to tell you that the people in the Virgin Islands will not work. They do not work. They like relief. We have carried them on a relief program and as long as they are carried on such a program they will not work. We are establishing an economy and standard of living they cannot support.

Senator BUTLER, myself, and two clerks went over to the island of Tortola, which is about the same size as the island of St. John. It is under England's control. Now, we have more people employed by the Government on the island of St. John than there are in private industries. The biggest employment there is Government employment, with padded pay rolls all the way down the line. I believe the records show that

there are 1,100 people on the Government pay roll in the Virgin Islands.

There is an Englishman in charge at the island of Tortola. An Englishman runs that island containing about the same number of people as the island of St. Thomas; he has all of those farmers working making a living, self-supporting, bringing their goods by little boats to the island of St. Thomas and he is running his island with 75 people. That is what the English are able to do.

The Interior Department under Tugwell and other New Dealers have planted a philosophy in these Virgin Islands that the United States must take care of them. These islanders could support themselves just as they do on the English-controlled island of Tortola if we gave them proper management. The Dutch had no trouble when they owned the islands.

I say to my colleagues that the program that we are adopting in the Virgin Islands is absolutely wrong. It is said there are more Virgin Islanders in the United States than there are down in the Virgin Islands. The average age of the worker in the Virgin Islands, according to statistics, is 54. I looked at their school-lunch program. They can raise everything in the Virgin Islands that they need. They can raise potatoes and vegetables, but the food that was used in the school-lunch program did not come from the Virgin Islands. Every bit of it was imported from this country. They had 160 pounds of potatoes for 120 youngsters. The meat, the butter, the vegetables, and the things that they could raise in the Virgin Islands were not raised there. They were imported, because we give it to them. As long as we continue with that program they will never become self-sustaining or self-supporting.

I am in favor of adopting the bill passed by the Senate. The Senate bill will start liquidation of the Company. There is a bona fide offer to buy the Virgin Islands Company for $1,500,000. It ought to be cleaned up. It would be far cheaper for us to put these people under the Red Cross if they insist on being treated as wards, but the program we are now adopting in the Virgin Islands is absolutely wrong. I am certain that these good people of the Virgin Islands want to be respected self-supporting folks. They cannot do it under the present program.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. After being down there did the gentleman think that there was as much agriculture in the Virgin Islands as there is in a good county in Iowa or Nebraska, or even a good township hardly?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, there is not much good land. They could be self-supporting if they went out and worked under proper encouragement from this country.

Mr. LECOMPTE. One good county in the Middle West could produce more than they are producing down there.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Oh, yes. I prefer the Senate bill. We can then in the Eighty-first Congress help to put these people back on a self-supporting basis. We should not continue the Tugwell program of the thirties.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the argument of my good friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] defeats itself. This $7,000,000 for the Virgin Islands is largely to put the people in industry and largely to start a public works program which is sadly needed. If there are any on relief, that will take them off relief. So, his argument really defeats itself.

I understand from reliable sources that in those islands the water is so bad that it is almost dangerous for anybody to drink it. We owe a duty to the inhabitants of the Virgin Islands. They are our wards. Why force those people to continue drinking this unsanitary water? I understand also that for the past several years there have not been any hospitals built and there have not been any roads built, and conditions down there are deplorable in every respect. When you talk about the pay of these workers on these public works and in private enterprise, they only get about $2 or $3 a day.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, it will be more expensive to deny these Virgin Islanders this $7,000,000 because the entire economy of the country would probably collapse and we would have practically everybody on relief. This is a humanitarian measure. It is not only humanitarian; it is our duty to take care of this situation in the Virgin Islands. The whole world will point to this example how the United States treats its wards down in the Virgin Islands.

I hope that the membership will realize that we ought to pass this measure with an overwhelming vote.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me reemphasize that the $7,700,000 which is carried in this bill is not to be used unless the people of the Virgin Islands to the extent of approximately $4,000,000 of that total apply to this Company for loans in order to go into business and enterprise themselves. This bill is designed for the specific purpose of enabling those people to establish essential industries and get out from under the wing of the Federal Treasury. It is the very purpose that the gentleman from Nebraska advocates, and it does away with the past program.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, it encourages private enterprise and encourages the establishment of small business, and keep these workers working and under more satisfactory conditions. I hope the House will see the justice of this thing and see what our duty is and pass the bill overwhelmingly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am quite familiar with this situation because it happens that most of the Virgin Islanders that are in America live in my district. I do not want to differ too radically with the gentleman from Nebraska, but there are only about 13,000 Virgin Islanders in America and there are 34,000 in the Virgin Islands. Eight thousand of the Virgin Islanders of America live in my district.

Our friend from Nebraska certainly said some things that are true, but they just do not happen to be related. This is not a relief bill. Granted that the $10,000,000 that was appropriated before went down there for relief and was not used correctly, granted that that may be true, this is still not a relief bill. This is to do just what the gentleman from Nebraska wants done. If you read the bill carefully you will find it states:

> For the further purpose of developing the industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, livestock, fishery, and forestry resources of the Virgin Islands, to establish, maintain, operate, and engage in, upon its own account, any appropriate enterprise, undertaking, or activity.

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

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This Company has been engaged in that business. They were chartered for it, but they have not accomplished a single thing. There is no reason to think they will accomplish anything in the future.

Mr. POWELL. This Company has accomplished everything. If it were not for this Company we would still have to spend money down there for the relief and the feeding of the people. This is their livelihood.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Danes had the islands for over 100 years and they had no trouble. They were quite self-supporting.

Mr. POWELL. Yes; that may be true. Also, if we could get this Company on its feet they would be self-supporting, but we have never put this Company on its feet correctly. If we get this Company on its feet, then they will be able to be self-supporting. You cannot tell people to go out and work and support themselves unless you give them something to do it with; is not that true? In Nebraska you have great farmers, but they have to have something in their hands to farm with.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This is really a relief program, if that is what you want it to be.

Mr. POWELL. No; this is not a relief program at all.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It has been all along.

Mr. POWELL. This is to develop in the people the character the gentleman has been talking about, so they will be able to take care of themselves.

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

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I go to the bank and borrow $500 in order to start a peanut store and a popcorn popper and put

myself in business, the gentleman from Nebraska would call that a relief program. That is exactly what it is not.

Mr. POWELL. If the gentleman did not, it would be all right, but if they did it he would call it relief.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is the soundest type of industrial operation on the face of God's green earth. That is what built this country. The gentleman from Nebraska knows this as well as anyone else.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is a relief program when the money is not paid back and you have to put in more and more money to keep the machine going.

Mr. POWELL. Yes, if it does not come back.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is what is going to happen in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What we have been doing in the Virgin Islands is what this bill is designed to take us out of, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. POWELL. We have been spending money in relief. With this, there is no relief. We are giving the people an opportunity. I call for passage without a record vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 132, noes 9.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 10, 1948:

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States;

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the American Turners Society in the United States;

H. R. 1572. An act for the relief of Basque aliens;

H. R. 4236. An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service;

H. R. 5155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to have made by the Public Roads Administration and the National Park Service a joint reconnaissance survey of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal between Great Falls, Md., and Cumberland, Md., and to report to the Congress upon the advisability and practicability of constructing thereon a parkway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5283. An act to provide for the disposal of surplus sand at Fort Story, Va.; and

H. R. 5816. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1947, relating to the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, and for other purposes.

On June 12, 1948:

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of powers of appointment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2359. An act to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $85,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4721. An act to remove the statutory limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy;

H. R. 4954. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennwick division of the Yakima project, Washington;

H. R. 5151. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James P. Love a patent to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5553. An act to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5587. An act to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6056. An act 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.;

H. R. 6078. An act to amend section 303 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; and

H. R. 6091. An act 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.

On June 14, 1948:

H. R. 669. An act to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy;

H. R. 3680. An act to amend sections 207, 213, 215, 216, 220, and 225, of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 5728. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5770. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6500. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

On June 16, 1948:

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;

H. R. 6407. An act 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;

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley;

H. R. 5134. An act to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes; and

H. R. 6730. An act to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years.

On June 17, 1948:

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of the Tampa Chapter, No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 3628. An act to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands; and

H. R. 4032. An act to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States.

ANNUAL REPORT, OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

REPORT ON JUVENILE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 725)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the juvenile court during the fiscal year 1946–47.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

LABOR DISPUTE AT OAK RIDGE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 726)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, it is my duty to report to the Congress concerning the labor dispute which recently existed at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The important facts concerning the dispute may be summarized as follows:

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory is Government-owned. Some 2,350 persons are there engaged in important atomic-energy research, but not directly in production of fissionable materials or weapons.

The dispute was between the Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. and the Atomic Trades and Labor Council, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The corporation operates the

laboratory under a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract with the Atomic Energy Commission. The corporation also operates two other important plants of the atomic-energy installation at Oak Ridge. The council represents some 900 employees who perform maintenance, operating, and service functions at the laboratory.

The recent dispute resulted from the failure of negotiations concerning both wages and working conditions. These negotiations were begun with the predecessor contractor in the latter part of November 1947 and continued with Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. beginning February 9, 1948.

It is clear that there was a difference in objectives sought by the council and the corporation. On the one hand, the council desired to preserve differentials over the two nearby atomic-energy plants as to wage rates and conditions of employment—differentials which have been in existence in the laboratory since its beginning. On the other hand, the corporation desired uniformity of wage rates and conditions of employment and the elimination of the laboratory differentials.

In a union meeting held Sunday, February 29, the employees voted to strike unless settlement were made by Friday midnight, March 5, and this intention was reaffirmed by another meeting on the night of March 3. Accordingly, on March 5, I issued Executive Order 9934, creating a Board of Inquiry pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act. At my request, both parties agreed to maintain the status quo until March 19.

On March 15 the Board of Inquiry submitted to me its first report. It found the existence of a labor dispute at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and it advised me of the facts of that dispute. It further found that grave danger to the national safety would result if the operations of the laboratory were interrupted.

Thereupon, at my request, the Attorney General on March 19 instituted an action and obtained an injunction in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee. This order enjoined both the corporation and the council, and all persons in active participation with them, from engaging in any strike or lock-out or from interfering with normal continuance of work, or from making any change in terms or conditions of employment other than by mutual agreement.

On March 24 I reconvened the Board of Inquiry. Negotiations between the parties continued, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. On May 18 the Board of Inquiry submitted to me its second report, stating that the position of the parties remained unaltered and the dispute unsettled.

On June 1 and 2 the National Labor Relations Board conducted a secret ballot of the employees to ascertain whether they wished to accept the final offer of settlement as stated and made by the employer. The employees, by a vote of 771 to 26, rejected the employer's last offer. On June 7 the National Labor Relations Board certified to the Attorney General the results of this election. On June 8 the employees at a union meeting took action looking to a possible stoppage if the injunction were lifted and if the employer unilaterally placed in effect the terms proposed in its final offer.

On June 10, pursuant to section 210 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, the Attorney General moved the court to discharge the injunction. The injunction was discharged on June 11.

During this period, the parties continued negotiations, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. On June 15 the parties reached agreement on the terms of a new contract.

All parties to this dispute and the Government agencies concerned complied with all legal and procedural requirements of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

A number of additional facts concerning this dispute are set forth in the first and second reports of the Board of Inquiry. Copies of these reports are transmitted to the Congress with this message.

Both parties are to be commended for achieving settlement of this dispute without an interruption of work.

The dispute at Oak Ridge has raised some question, nevertheless, as to the sufficiency of present collective-bargaining methods in atomic-energy installations.

This question is somewhat different from others which have arisen in the past. On the one hand, it is clear that the national security and the development of the beneficial arts and sciences are bound up with the progress of our atomic-energy program. Thus, every dispute which threatens to seriously impair that program imperils the national health and safety.

On the other hand, it is equally clear that the progress of our atomic-energy program requires the support and drive of broad sectors of the American economy. In order to encourage such support, the Atomic Energy Commission has lodged in its contractors a large measure of responsibility and authority. The progress of the program is equally dependent upon the full and willing support of the men and women who work in atomic-energy plants and laboratories.

Under these circumstances, it is imperative that the most successful techniques of the collective-bargaining process should be adopted for the atomic-energy program.

The objective should be twofold: The parties should continue to enjoy the maximum of voluntary action and freedom of choice; secondly, the public interest must be protected at all times.

I believe that special study should be given to the problem of peaceful and orderly settlement of labor disputes in Government-owned, privately operated atomic-energy installations, such as those at Richland, Wash.; Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Los Alamos, N. Mex.; the Argonne National Laboratory, Chicago, Ill.; and others.

I propose, therefore, to establish a commission, composed of men having expert knowledge in the field of labor relations, to study this problem and to make such recommendations as they may find necessary. The commission should explore the question whether any special legislation should be enacted to protect the national interest without depriving management or labor organizations of the initiative and freedom necessary for the progress of our atomic-energy program. The commission should study ways and means of adapting to the atomic-energy program the best of our experience in the complex field of labor relations. The commission should concern itself also with special aspects of the problem, such as questions of bargaining representation, uniformity of working conditions and wages, and procedures for grievance handling.

The commission should concern itself, in short, with the broad code of conduct which should be observed by management and labor in their relations with each other in this vital program.

In appointing this commission I shall request the advice of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy both as to the membership of the commission and the specific questions to be studied.

I believe that the report of this commission, which should be submitted as soon as possible, will be of great value in guiding contractors, labor organizations, and the Government in this new and vital field. I am confident that this is the best avenue to follow to achieve and maintain that proper balance between freedom and responsibility which is the tradition in all our economic relations, including those between management and labor.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

TO AMEND RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) (2) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, be further amended by striking therefrom the following words and figures: "Section 4 (a) (1), (2), and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Sections 4 (a) (1) and (2)"; and that section 4 (c) thereof be amended by striking out "$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$45,000,000."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out $25,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof $35,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry," approved June 28, 1947, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1949," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1954."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 1, line 8, strike out "June 30, 1954," and insert "June 30, 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. KEEFE. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I placed in the RECORD a report of the investigation staff of the Appropriations Committee referring to certain matters relating to the administration of unemployment compensation and the employment services in the State of Tennessee. The State director of these services published a reply in most of the newspapers of that State. My answer follows:

My attention has been called to an article entitled "Hake's Reply to Charges," appearing in various Tennessee newspapers. Because the gentleman—under pressure—has attempted to brush aside plain facts and truth with falsehoods and innuendoes, I deem it my duty to give the people of Tennessee the facts.

W. O. Hake is the State employment security commissioner for the State of Tennessee. As such he has under his direction State employees who are paid entirely out of funds appropriated by the Congress of the United States. The Unemployment Compensation Division and the Employment Service are both financed out of funds raised by virtue of a tax imposed by Federal law on covered pay rolls. It thus is important that the Federal Government know how these funds are being expended by the States. The Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of this particular appropriation directed that an investigation be made in the field in various States to determine the necessity for the large appropriation requested. Mr. Hake appeared before my subcommittee, along with a number of other State administrators, on April 2, 1948. His testimony is found in the printed record of the committee hearings. While he was on the witness stand, I made this statement, which appears on page 239 of the hearings:

I would like to say to you that that is one of the things that the investigating staff of the Appropriations Committee is going to make a thorough study of, and they are trained men in the field of investigation. I expect they will come up with some real information to this committee, so that we can get a picture of the situation which we have heretofore had.

Mr. Hake's response was:

I want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for inaugurating that policy. The State men will unanimously welcome it.

Thereafter the Appropriations Committee sent investigators into a number of States, including Tennessee. Their preliminary report indicated serious violations of the Hatch Act. The committee decided to have a further investigation made and sent the chief of the investigating staff, Mr. Lee, to conduct the investigation. I may say that everyone in Washington knows that Mr. Lee is one of the most courageous and outstanding investigators in the Federal service, and the attempt of Mr. Hake to "smear" him is the usual artifice adopted by one who is cornered and caught and who is seeking to distract attention from the real facts.

When Mr. Lee's report came to the committee, I was instructed by the committee to lay it before the Congress and to present the preliminary facts disclosed by the Attorney General of the United States and to the United States Civil Service Commission with a demand that a full and complete investigation be made by the FBI and the Civil Service Commission, and with the further demand that such steps be taken in accordance with law as the facts might indicate to be necessary.

Mr. Hake in his statement in no way denies the facts but resorts to the old trick of the accused when confronted with unassailable documentary evidence by calling me names. Among other things, he states in reference to me:

He is well known as having a fixed hatred of any progressive legislation enacted by the Democratic administrations of the last 16 years. The social-security program appears to be one of his pet hates, and especially the Employment Service.

He further says that the action taken by the subcommittee and the Congress would have emasculated the employment security program and that he, along with other State administrators, testified before my committee against this unwarranted position. I categorically state that such statement can only be properly designated as an unmitigated falsehood. The facts are clear. Judge Hake, in company with other leading State administrators, came before my committee and urged that the Congress adopt the program which I was advocating. His testimony appears on pages 234 to 240 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. I need only to quote this to demonstrate the falsity of Judge Hake's statement. He made this statement to the committee:

As I review it, Congress has done two outstanding things up to the moment: No. 1, last week when it determined that these two programs (unemployment compensation and employment services) should not be separated when they defeated the reorganization plan; and No. 2, this year they did another outstanding job when they decided that the program would not go over to the Labor Department. Then, by inference certainly, they would decide by these two actions that the program should be administered in the Federal Security Agency. I appeared before both committees along that line, and I think now the question is, Congress needs to do something to carry out what they have most decidedly said they want and which is apparently not going to happen from the executive branch of the Government. I think the State administrators are unanimous in their thinking now that the reorganization should be effected yesterday. I mean by that without delay.

In statement after statement appearing in this record, Judge Hake firmly supported me in the very program which he so viciously assails and condemns in his so-called reply. For 3 years now he has appeared before my committee and urged the very thing which has now been accomplished and written into the law. He now says that this action on the part of the Congress would destroy the social-security program. He of all people knows that there is not a single word of truth in such a statement. The full Appropriations Committee accepted with practically no dissent the recommendations which I offered to consolidate in the Federal Security Agency, the unemployment compensation and the employment service activities. The House of Representatives with only 29 dissenting votes approved that program. It then went to the Senate, and the Senate took a contrary view, largely because of the opposition of Mr. Truman. In the conference between the House and Senate, an agreement was reached fully sustaining the reorganization program which I had proposed, and the Senate completely receded from its position. Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, was a member of that conference committee and signed the conference report.

It is interesting to note that the conference report was overwhelmingly adopted by both the House and the Senate, and the bill went to the President. The President vetoed the bill and thereafter on June 16 the House by a vote of 288–113 overrode the Presidential veto. It is also interesting to note that Representatives GORE, MURRAY, PHILLIPS, JENNINGS, COOPER, and DAVIS of Tennessee all supported the position of the writer and voted to override the Presidential veto. Only Representatives PRIEST, COURTNEY, and EVINS voted to sustain the President.

It is also interesting to note that the Senate by a vote of 72–17 voted to override the veto of the President and thus by an overwhelming vote placed its seal of approval upon the action proposed by the writer. It is also interesting to note that both Senator MCKELLAR and Senator STEWART of Tennessee voted to override

the President and voted to support the position taken by the writer.

Thus when Judge Hake attempts to indicate in his alleged reply that "Congressman KEEFE's political prestige had thus reached an all-time low and something had to be done to restore it," he is again making a statement which he knows is not in accord with the facts.

It is also interesting to note that while the conference between the House and the Senate was going on, W. O. Hake, Commissioner, sent the following telegram to me and to every member of the Tennessee House delegation:

H. R. 6355 as passed by the House contains a reorganization rider which has been rejected by the Senate. The issue now goes to conference. As administrator of the employment security program in Tennessee, I strongly endorse the position which has been taken by the House. My attitude is shared by the vast majority of State administrators of this program. Reorganization and integration of the Federal level similar to operations now maintained in all States would be most helpful to our State part of the program. Present dual set-up on Federal level leads to irritation, inefficiency, time and money wasted both on the Federal and State level, and should not be tolerated by Congress. I strongly urge that you lend your support to the conference committee in sustaining the House's former action.

Does this telegram and the testimony of Judge Hake before my committee indicate that he opposed the position which I had taken? I repeat that Mr. Hake has evaded the facts and has resorted to abuse and vilification in an attempt to becloud the issue.

He further attempts, in his alleged reply, to stir up political emotions by his intolerant and hate-inspiring references to Mr. Lee and to myself. I happen to know that in making this statement he was doing so under orders from higher-ups in Tennessee, and if he is the man that I have always thought he was, he will let the people of Tennessee know the truth and repudiate his statement.

He attempts to inject into the picture the fact that I am a Republican from Wisconsin and that my political fortunes are "low" and that I have lost caste with my colleagues, and so forth, and so forth. The record of the congressional action and the overwhelming support given me by the Congressmen and Senators clearly demonstrates the falsity of this statement. His own telegram, above quoted, ought to cause him to hang his head in shame for daring to write such a reply, even though he was under pressure from political superiors to do so.

The real truth is that the employees of State government in Tennessee themselves know whether they have been subject to a political shake-down by which 10 percent of 1 month's salary has been taken from them for political purposes. It will not do for Judge Hake to say that these contributions were voluntary. I have many letters in my file that clearly demonstrate the contrary, written by State employees who were forced to contribute against their will because of fear of loss of jobs.

As a Republican from Wisconsin, I am interested in seeing that these two great programs throughout the Nation are conducted in the public interest and that the employees, paid for 100 percent by Federal funds, carry on their jobs in the interests of the people and not be subjected to the political dictation of any political machine. I have served notice that these investigations will continue, and no amount of personal abuse will stop them. This is Federal money that is being used, and to that extent the Congress of the United States has an interest in seeing that Federal law is not violated.

I can assure Judge Hake that so far as it lies within my power I shall see to it that he has his day in court and that all of the facts are presented. I know nothing of the political situation in Tennessee and have no intention of injecting myself into the politics of Tennessee. I believe the good people of Tennessee, however, are no different from the good people of Wisconsin or any other State in the Union and that they will resent efforts to cover up plain facts with a campaign of smear, abuse and vilification.

I have every right to assume that the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission of the United States Government will follow through on this investigation and that in due time Mr. Hake and his political associates will have ample opportunity to try to explain away the mass of fully documented evidence that has been gathered by the investigators of the House Appropriations Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two radio addresses by Father Saloway. I do not know whether this will exceed the limit allowed, but, if so, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATOR TO LEASE PROPERTY AT 811 VERMONT AVENUE NW.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2706) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in a building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., in Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to lease for commercial purposes for periods not exceeding 10 years and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest, such space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building, as was leased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for commercial purposes on July 30, 1947, the date title to such building was transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the United States of America by section 306, title III, Public Law 268, Eightieth Congress. The rentals received pursuant to this act may be deposited into a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 303b), shall be available to pay the cost of maintenance, upkeep, and repair of the space so leased and for the establishment of necessary reserves therefor: *Provided*, That except for such necessary reserves, the unobligated balances of rentals so deposited into the Treasury shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts.

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

PERMISSION TO HEAR AND DETERMINE CLAIMS OF CERTAIN MOTOR CARRIERS

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1260) to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created and established a Motor Carrier Claims Commission, hereafter referred to as the Commission.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall hear and determine, according to law, existing claims against the United States arising out of the taking by the United States of possession or control of any of the motor-carrier transportation systems described in Executive Order No. 9462, dated August 11, 1944 (C. F. R., 1944 supp., p. 70). The settlement of any claim prior to the enactment of this act shall not prevent the Commission from hearing and determining such claim if it determines that the principles of equity as administered by the courts require that such settlement be set aside and that such claim be heard and determined.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall consist of a Chairman and two other members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall each receive a salary of $15,000 per year. At least two of such members shall be learned in the law. Each member shall take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and to discharge faithfully the duties of his office. The members shall hold office until the dissolution of the Commission as hereinafter provided. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments. Two members shall constitute a quorum, and the agreement of two members shall be necessary to any and all determinations for the transaction of the business of the Commission, and if there be a quorum, no vacancy shall impair or affect the business of the Commission, or its determinations.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall appoint a clerk and such other employees as shall be requisite to conduct the business of the Commission. All such employees shall take oath for the faithful discharge of their duties and shall be under the direction of the Commission in the performance thereof.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall meet at such times and places as it may prescribe, shall keep a full written record of all its hearings and proceedings which shall be open to public inspection, and shall have power to establish its rules of procedure.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall receive claims for a period of 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, and not thereafter. The jurisdiction of the Commission over claims presented to it as provided in section 2 of this act shall be exclusive; but nothing in this act shall prevent any person who does not elect to present his claim to the Commission from pursuing any other remedy available to him. The Attorney General or his assistants shall represent the United States in all claims presented to the Commission.

SEC. 7. Any member of the Commission or any employee of the Commission, designated in writing for the purpose by the chairman, may administer oaths and examine witnesses. Any member of the Commission may require by subpena (1) the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of all necessary books, papers, documents, correspondence, and other evidence, from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing; or (2) the taking of depositions before any designated individual competent to administer oaths under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory. In the case of a deposition, the testimony shall be reduced to writing by the individual taking the deposition or under his direction and shall be subscribed by the deponent. In taking oral testimony, opportunity shall be given for cross-examination, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe. Witnesses subpenaed to testify or whose depositions are taken pursuant to this act, and the officers or persons taking the same, shall severally be entitled to the same fees and mileage as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

SEC. 8. The final determination of the Commission shall be in writing, shall be filed with its clerk, and shall include (1) its findings of the facts upon which its conclusions are based; (2) a statement (a) whether there are any just grounds for relief of the claimant and, if so, the amount thereof; (b) whether there are any allowable offsets, counterclaims, or other deductions, and, if so, the amount thereof; and (3) a statement of its reasons for its findings and conclusions.

SEC. 9. (a) When the final determination of the Commission has been filed with the clerk of said Commission the clerk shall give notice of the filing of such determination to the parties to the proceeding in manner and form as directed by the Commission. Such determination shall be subject to review in the same manner as is provided for cases in the Court of Claims upon application to the Supreme Court within 3 months from the date of the filing of such determination with the clerk.

SEC. 10. In each claim, after the proceedings have been finally concluded, the Commission shall promptly submit its report to Congress.

The report to Congress shall contain (1) the final determination of the Commission; (2) a transcript of the proceedings or judgment upon review, if any, with the instructions of the Supreme Court; and (3) a statement of how each Commissioner voted upon the final determination of the claim.

SEC. 11. (a) When the report of the Commission determining any claimant to be entitled to recover has been filed with Congress, such report shall have the effect of, and be paid in the same manner as is provided for, a final judgment of the Court of Claims.

The payment of any claim, after its determination in accordance with this act, shall be a full discharge of the United States of all claims and demands touching any of the matters involved in the controversy.

(b) A final determination against a claimant made and reported in accordance with this act shall forever bar any further claim or demand against the United States arising out of the matter involved in the controversy.

SEC. 12. The Commission shall determine all claims presented to it as expeditiously as possible, and shall make a report to Congress of its progress not later than the fifteenth of April of each year until its dissolution.

SEC. 13. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of 2 years after the first meeting of the Commission or at such earlier time after the expiration of the 6 months' period of limitation set forth in section 6 hereof as the Commission shall have made its final report to Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WALTER. No; I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] to demand the second.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin for 20 minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I shall take only a few minutes to explain this bill which is a very simple one. During the war some 103 trucking companies operating in the Midwest, principally west and south of Chicago, found themselves in difficulty because of strikes. Finding that the strikes could not be settled the Government issued an order taking over the truck lines. Due notice of that seizure was posted and the ODT sent their representatives to St. Paul and thereafter proceeded to operate the 103 lines.

The first thing done by the manager in behalf of the Government was to insist that the trucking companies pay the wages which had been in dispute and which had not been settled between the operators and the truck drivers. Thereafter, the representatives of the Government continued to manage and operate these truck lines and exercise control over them, differing in degree naturally, in the various lines.

It is the claim of the operators of the truck lines which were taken over by the Government that they were damaged by this action, by the seizure of their property, and they make demand on the Government under the due-process clause of the Constitution for the payment of damages.

This bill would simply set up a commission of three members to be appointed by the President to hear and determine the claim of the operators of these truck lines.

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

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BRYSON. Does not the bill carry a House committee amendment reading "to determine such claims, if any there be"?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I may say to the gentleman that some amendments were suggested in the House committee including the one to which the gentleman refers.

The present motion is to pass the bill as it passed the Senate. I would have no objection to the amendment. My only thought in making the motion as I did was to pass a bill which had passed the Senate and avoid the necessity of going to conference. I believe the amendments that were made by the House committee would not substantially affect the bill one way or the other. I would be perfectly agreeable if they could be accepted by the Senate but I fear that if we go to conference the bill will not be passed.

This bill has been the subject of extended hearings in the Senate, and hearings were held by the House committee.

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

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I judge then the gentleman's objection to any amendment is in order to facilitate passage?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct. I am moving that the bill be passed by the House as it was passed in the Senate to avoid the necessity of a conference. As I said before, I personally would have no objection to the House amendments.

Bear in mind that these truck operators will be required to submit their claims to this Commission within 6 months after the law becomes effective, that no person will be entitled to recover a dime unless he proves he was damaged and unless he proves he was damaged in accordance with the rules and decisions made many times under the due-process clause.

I think this is a very just bill and a very simple and easy way to get these claims adjudicated.

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

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, the procedure set up in this bill is a substitute for procedure in the Court of Claims, which is cumbersome and the only remedy available to these people right now.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. The effect of this bill is to substitute the Commission for a hearing of the case by the Court of Claims.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct. It is in the interest of economy both for the claimants and for the Government. It follows a policy that was adopted by this Congress and has been used on many occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Members of the House can agree that during the

last few days we have been going at a merry clip. I suppose if somebody at some time could devise a means of eliminating the last week of a congressional session or any legislative session, the country would erect a statue to him, and it really should.

I do not criticize the leadership here for the necessity of bringing a lot of these bills up with very little time for consideration. I realize the situation with which they are faced.

But here, Mr. Speaker, is a bill that we should not, if we are going to act in good conscience, consider in this manner. What we are doing in effect is passing an appropriation bill involving at least eight or nine million dollars and the possibility of an amount even in excess of that, with no check on the facts, simply on the basis of turning over to a commission of three men this matter and saying: "You decide what these people are to get, you give it to them by certifying it to the Congress, and the Congress will have no further check."

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Of course the Government can appeal any decision just like in the Court of Claims.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The Government may appeal, that is true; but as far as this Congress is concerned, what it is doing is passing a claims bill in an amount of over eight or nine million dollars. We are doing it here in a hurry without a full discussion of the contentions and the facts in the case.

What does the bill do? I am somewhat in doubt as to what the committee actually desires in view of the fact that the committee some time ago reported a Senate bill with amendments. Now, today, in order to hurry it up and get it through and spend this money, they are saying, "Well, we are going to forget about the precautions that the committee wanted to put in this legislation, we are going to take it from the Senate just as it came to us even though when we were thinking a little slower and probably using better judgment we wanted to have amendments on the bill, we wanted to make some corrections in it."

That is the evidence, Mr. Speaker, of how fast we are trying to move. The bill provides for three commissioners at a salary of $15,000 a year each, and the bill says they shall complete their functions within the next 2 years. In other words, that will be their term of office. But you and I know if they have not determined all of the issues involved in that time, it is going be another 2 or 3 years that these commissioners will continue in their jobs, and draw their salaries, with their staff, plus their expenses.

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

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Is there any indication here that these claimants cannot have recourse to the courts of the United States?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The evidence is that the Court of Claims has ample jurisdiction, has complete jurisdiction over this matter. The proponents of the legislation were not willing to have an ordinary bill which would confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims passed, because they admit—at least some of them do to whom I have talked—that the Court of Claims has jurisdiction. That is not an issue at all as far as being a reason why a commission has to be formed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my position that that certainly is the way this should be handled. We have a court already set up to handle just such cases as this. But here we come in and bypass that court and say that we are going to create some jobs and spend more money. Why? I think the primary reason is the feeling that probably the commissioners will be a little more lenient in the rule of damage that might apply or the amount of proof required.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. Will the gentleman inform the House who are the beneficiaries of this legislation?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There are some 103 carriers, I believe it is, who, during the war, refused to comply with a directive of the War Labor Board increasing the wages of employees. In order to avert a strike the Government took over some of these carriers. There is a question of law even now as to whether the Government did come in and operate and take over all the carriers who are now making claim. I believe it is connected in the case of at least eight of them that they were taken over and operated, but may I also call the attention of the House to the fact that because the Government operated a business and that business did not make money is, in my judgment, no reason for a substantial claim against the Government in that regard. I remember sitting on the War Claims Committee when an order of the Government closed up some gold mines out West by virtue of which severe damage was done. But those people did not have a special commission set up to assess their damages. I believe that those who have a just claim are entitled to be recompensed, and I am not arguing against that at all. But they should go to the duly established courts of this country which we authorized them to do, and there prove their claims and prove their damages and obtain their awards.

I do not believe in the advisability, particularly at this time in the rush of adjournment, of pushing through and ramming through a bill involving as much money as this.

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

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT].

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that during World War I it was necessary for the Government to seize the railroads of this country and to operate them during the entire course of the war. Immediately after the war the Congress set up a Claims Commission to hear the claims of those railroads against the Government. During World War II it was necessary for the Government to seize another segment of the great transportation system of the country; 103 over-the-road truck lines principally situated in the upper Mississippi Valley. They serve an area covering 15 States, and in most instances are the only means of transportation from town to town, especially the smaller towns. Those truck lines were seized in August 1944, under exactly the same statute that the railroads were seized during World War I.

Now, the Constitution of the United States is clear that this Government of ours cannot seize private property without providing just compensation, and that is what this bill seeks to do. It seeks to set up a Claims Commission so that that Commission may determine if any of these carriers are entitled to compensation and, if so, how much compensation.

I think I know of the interest of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] in this controversy. The fact of the matter is that there are some truck lines in the United States which the Government did not seize. As you all know, the trucking business in the United States is a young, growing, vigorous business and very competitive. I dare say that there are some truck lines in the State of Wisconsin that were not seized during the war. From that you may well conclude what the interest of the Members of the House who object to this bill really is.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Of course, the gentleman knows that extensive hearings were held on this bill in the Senate and before the House committee. Does the gentleman know whether or not the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] appeared before those committees and made known his views at that time?

Mr. DEVITT. The gentleman from Wisconsin did not appear before any of those committees. This bill passed the Senate unanimously after extensive hearings. It was unanimously reported out by the House Committee on the Judiciary. It is a fair, just, and reasonable measure.

As I understood the arguments of the gentleman from Wisconsin, they were two in number. No. 1, he said this bill makes a huge appropriation of some $8,000,000. The fact of the matter is, it does not do any such thing. If he and all of us will read the bill on page 5, section 11, we will find that the payment of these claims, if any are adjudicated by the Claims Commission, is handled in exactly the same way as claims from the Court of Claims.

The No. 2 objection he made to the bill is, why do not these 103 motor carriers go to the United States Court of Claims? I will be very happy to answer that question for the gentleman. Three years ago three of these motor carriers decided to try their cases in the Court of Claims. So they started a lawsuit in the Court of Claims, and that lawsuit has not been

decided even today. The hearing examiner has just finished taking testimony. A motion was made in the course of the hearings on one of these claims asking the court if they would not consolidate all pending cases so that they could all be heard together. The court denied that motion. So the object of setting up this commission is to avoid a multiplicity of suits.

Is it going to be necessary for these loyal Americans who had their trucking lines taken from them during the war to wait for 10, 12, or 15 years before they can have a determination in the United States Court of Claims, which is already overcrowded?

I will tell you another reason why the Court of Claims is an inadequate tribunal to hear these suits. It is because under the statute the Court of Claims has jurisdiction only over claims against the Government that sound in contract or implied contract. Many of the claims of these trucking companies are tort claims, accident claims, and the like.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. I think most of us agree that we have been concerned in these years following the war with taking care of many claims under the Contract Settlement Act, among other things, where patriotic citizens came to the fore when an appeal was made to them. I think we should not neglect these honest, patriotic truck owners. The action of the Government in taking over these truck lines was a very precipitous proposition. They had a labor dispute in this 15-State area, and the President of the United States issued an order to the Office of Defense Transportation in which he ordered them to take over these truck lines. A Federal manager was appointed. He seized the truck lines. He operated them. He controlled their activities. He controlled their rate-making. He told them how much they had to pay their employees. These truck owners have legitimate claims against the Government as a result of that operation.

This resolution seeks to set up a commission to hear and determine these claims. It is not expedient to go to the Court of Claims. It seems to me it is a reasonable request of the Congress.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVITT. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us why a commission can review these cases and determine the damages any more expeditiously than the Court of Claims can do it, since the Court of Claims has said that each case is to be considered on its individual merits, its individual facts, which I believe is the contention of the proponents. Does not the Commission have to do the same thing?

Mr. DEVITT. No. 1 is that the docket of the Court of Claims is years behind. No. 2, that the procedure in the Court of Claims, if the gentleman is acquainted with it, is for hearing commissioners or examiners to go out all over the country and take testimony. They come in and present their findings. Those findings have to stand in line until the other business of the court is disposed of. The third reason is that the Court of Claims has no jurisdiction over tort matters.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman complains that there are certain phases of this matter that are not within the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims.

Mr. DEVITT. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yet the proponents of the legislation refuse to accept an amendment which would confer jurisdiction on the court over those phases which they do not have jurisdiction over.

Mr. DEVITT. That may be true. I have no knowledge of any amendments to the bill. I know that extensive hearings were had and that matter did not come up, although careful consideration was given.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the principal objection to this bill made by my distinguished young friend from Wisconsin is in the fact that a commission of three people is to be appointed. Let us for a moment examine the procedure in the Court of Claims. In the Court of Claims, in actions ex contractu, a hearing is fixed by a hearing examiner. He hears all of the facts. The hearing is in Washington or anywhere that witnesses are available so that they may testify. After he prepares the facts and the findings thereon, the record is submitted to the Court of Claims. Our Court of Claims has a docket which would take them 3 years to become current, even if no additional cases were added to it. In order for these people to stay in business, it is necessary that they get relief more quickly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder, then, if it would not be more advisable for the Committee on the Judiciary to recommend the creation of another branch of the Court of Claims to clear off not only the truck cases but the other cases that you are complaining about which are pending.

Mr. WALTER. May I say to the gentleman that the Committee on the Judiciary has reported many bills for the establishment of new judgeships throughout the Unted States, and for some reason or another, probably because this is 1948, favorable action has not been taken on those bills.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The fact is that Congress adopted this policy years ago, and we can not make over the Court of Claims just to suit somebody's whim.

Mr. WALTER. Of course not.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. We provide in the bill that the Attorney General is authorized to hear these claims which cannot be heard in other places, is that correct?

Mr. WALTER. That is entirely correct. It seems to me in the long run, the Government is going to save money because after all you must bear in mind the fact that whatever claim is paid is going to be paid with interest, and if claimants must wait for years, which I am sure will elapse before the claims are finally disposed of, we are going to pay a very large sum of money in interest.

Now, there is one thing you must bear in mind: There is no intention on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary to make a finding of liability. The question of whether or not the United States is liable in each of these cases is a question of law and of fact, but there is no finding. Therefore, this cannot possibly be construed as a large claims bill, because there must first be a finding that there was a tort, an illegal taking, and after that fact has been determined, then there is the question of whether or not the taking resulted in damage.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have had a great deal of experience in condemnation cases of lands for reservoirs, dams, and so forth. Is there any difference in principle in what you propose than you have in the ordinary court, where the land owner is entitled to a speedy trial and a quick determination of the issues, and interest on the judgment?

Mr. WALTER. Oh, no. It is a well-known method of disposing of matters of this sort, and I think that in simple justice we should approve the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I do this merely to get an official declaration from the gentleman who is now presenting the bill that there is no intention on the part of the Judiciary Committee of the House to admit an illegal taking in any case.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I may say in answer to the gentleman's question that the bill contains no legislative finding. It is my own judgment, after hearing the testimony, that what was done by the Government amounted to a taking. However, I see nothing in the bill that passed the Senate which would foreclose adjudication of that question by the commissioners and by the courts.

Mr. HOBBS. And nothing that would foreclose the necessity of proving an illegal taking on the part of the Government.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. In my judgment, the gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to say that I am not opposed to this bill. However, I feel it is my duty to say a word or two about the amendments which were adopted by the

subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which heard this bill, and which will not be in the bill if the motion which has been made by the gentleman from Iowa is finally agreed to. It was felt by some of the members of this subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee that the language of the Senate bill might amount to a legislative finding of a taking. I want the RECORD to unmistakably show that it was the unanimous desire of the subcommittee that heard this bill that there be no legislative finding that there was a taking, either legal or illegal. The claims might finally result, notwithstanding what has been said before, even if the taking were legal, because the alleged taking was under the war powers, and of course that taking could be legal.

In the Senate bill, after the word "taking," the committee has written into the bill the phrase "if any."

I repeat, I wish the record to unmistakably show that there has been no legislative finding that there was a "taking," either legal or illegal by the Government.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Under the bill as it is now before us, however, which is the bill as it came from the Senate, there is some question as to whether there has been such a legislative finding, in view of the fact that the amendment that the committee wanted to put in is not presently in the bill.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes; there was some question in the mind of the subcommittee, but I am pleased to note that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] has said that the sponsors of the bill do not consider the language to be a legislative finding that there was a taking, either legal or illegal.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the full 5 minutes, but I think the best argument against the adoption of this bill that has come to us from the Senate came from someone who said he did not oppose this bill at all—from a member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], who pointed out to you that after the House Committee on the Judiciary had held its deliberations on this bill, a majority recommended some amendments that you are not given a chance to vote on here on the floor of the House today. In their haste to get this thing through, the deliberations of the House Judiciary Committee are being disregarded. I have not heard anything said by the three gentlemen who spoke in favor of this bill here in this late evening that dissuades me from the opinion that the creation of this commission for the settling of these claims is utterly wrong in principle. Here we have a great variety of circumstances among a large number of trucking companies who have a variety of claims to present, and the only argument I have heard is this: Now we have got all these claims; the way to settle them is by a commission, so we will get it done quickly.

Every one of these cases is not going to have to be pursued in the courts. Under the usual procedure, the claimants set out to establish one or two claims, then usually the rest can be quickly disposed of.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. I wonder if the gentleman was in the Chamber when I made the statement that this procedure is exactly the same procedure that was used following World War I in the case of the railroads.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I was here and heard the gentleman make that statement. Even if that were true you cannot make one right by the duplication of a wrong; and here you have admitted that the men sent out to investigate this by the Court of Claims have now completed their work; they have filed their reports. Now you are asking this House hastily to set up a procedure that will call for a duplication of the same work.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No. The statement was that several trucking companies had begun suit and that there was a proceeding in a few cases. They have not concluded them.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. But have there not been investigations completed and reports filed in some of those cases?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No; the cases are still being tried.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I understood the gentleman from Minnesota to say that some reports had been completed.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

I wish the gentleman to understand the situation. Each one of these would be a separate suit and several have been begun. Many months have elapsed, a great deal of testimony has been taken, and nothing has been concluded.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Is it not true that each of these cases is going to have to be dealt with separately even if you do set up this high-salaried commission to hear those claims?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Very true, but the whole situation is this: That you require these people to litigate 103 cases in the Court of Claims that they must wait years for their cases to be reached on the docket, just exactly like the railroads would have had to wait, just like these Japanese claimants would have waited. So as a matter of simple justice and following a policy which was adopted years ago we have created a special commission which will have nothing to do but work on these claims until they get them disposed of, and not longer than a 2-year-limitation period.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Does the chairman of the subcommittee approve of a policy where some of these cases have been partially heard and are now pending before the court, to now set up a separate administrative agency to do the same work in those cases over again?

Mr. GYWNNE of Iowa. No, no; the bill specifically provides that any claimant may come before this Commission or he may go before the Court of Claims and file his case there if he so desires.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. What is the attitude of the administrative agency which had this job to do during the war with respect to the setting up of this Commission? Is it not true that the ODT and the Department of Justice have opposed this proposition?

Mr. DEVITT. May I say to the gentleman that at the time the Government took over these truck lines it told the truckers they were going to be compensated. Now there are some technical objections on the part of the Department of Justice as to whether they were taken over. That is why it has been emphasized by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH]. This bill does not determine the question whether or not they have been taken over. That is something that lies within the province of this Commission.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin), there were—ayes 90, noes 28.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTS-IN-AID TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES IN PROVIDING MEDICAL CARE AND TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2861), as amended, to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman tell us something about this bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from New York that extensive hearings have been had not only by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, but also in the Senate. This is to provide hospitalization for those Filipino veterans who served in the Army of the United States during the war with Japan, those who were not only taken in by order of the President of the United States, but those guerrillas who later became a part of our armed forces under orders of the commander in chief, General MacArthur. At the present time in the three hospitals in the Philippines there are approximately 3,000 disabled Filipino veterans.

Mr. BUCK. What is the annual cost of the bill?

Mr. KEARNEY. The total cost of the bill is about $25,000,000 for the three hospitals.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman says the total cost is $25,000,000?

Mr. KEARNEY. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Why should we pay these costs for the Filipinos? They were fighting for their own independence. Why should we bear this burden?

Mr. KEARNEY. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that these veterans were duly enlisted in the Army of the United States. It is my humble opinion that we not only have a moral obligation but a legal responsibility to those veterans for the reason that they are in the same category as the veterans in our own hospitals in this country. They were soldiers of the United States armed forces, wearing our uniforms and fighting alongside our own men. They are the men of Bataan and Corregidor.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Were they a part of our own Army?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

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

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I may say that the former Governor General of the Philippines, also a former distinguished Member of this body, appeared before our committee and testified on behalf of this legislation.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is correct and the gentleman gave our committee a true and complete picture of the situation at present existing in the Philippines with particular reference to the hospital Victoria Luna. We are grateful to him for the complete and true picture as it exists today.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to assist the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for veterans, as defined in section 2 of this act, who are in need of hospitalization for disabilities, determined by the Veterans' Administration under laws which it administers to be connected with the service described in such section, the President is authorized, subject to the provisions of this act, to furnish aid in the form of grants to the Republic of the Philippines (a) for the construction and equipping of hospitals in the Philippines to be used exclusively for such medical care and treatment and (b) for expenses incident to such medical care and treatment in either the hospitals so constructed and equipped or other hospitals in the Philippines.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of section 1 of this act, the term "veterans" means persons who served in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941, including among such military forces organized guerrilla forces under commanders appointed, designated, or subsequently recognized by the Commander in Chief, Southwest Pacific Area, or other competent authority in the Army of the United States, and who were discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable.

SEC. 3. Any grant for the construction and equipping of a hospital may be made prior to or following its completion: *Provided*, That the total of such grants shall not exceed $22,500,000.

SEC. 4. Grants for expenses incident to hospitalization may be made for a period not to exceed 5 years to reimburse the Republic of the Philippines for moneys expended for such hospitalization: *Provided*, That the total of such grants shall not exceed $3,285,000 for any fiscal year.

SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations and impose such conditions on the receipt of financial aid as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act; and he may delegate in whole or in part the authority conferred upon him by this act to any officer or officers of the United States.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

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

CONVEYING LAND IN TENNESSEE TO THE CITY OF JOHNSON CITY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City, 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, strike out all after line 23 over to and including line 7, page 3, and insert:

"SEC. 2. The tract of land authorized to be transferred by the first section of this act shall be used by the grantee for fair grounds and recreational purposes; and the deed of conveyance of such lands shall contain (1) the provision that all such property shall be used and maintained for the purposes for which it was conveyed for a period of not less than 20 years, and that in the event such property ceases to be used or maintained for such purposes during such period, or is alienated or an attempt is made to alienate such property during such period, all or any portion of such property shall in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States, revert to the United States; and (2) such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States. The deed shall reserve to the United States the interests in fissionable material as provided in Executive Order 9908, dated December 5, 1947: *Provided*, That Johnson City shall pay 50 percent of appraised value of its property to be determined by the Veterans' Administration."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO PRESCRIBE RATES OF PAY FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS AT FIELD INSTALLATIONS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2794) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 284), as amended (38 U. S. C. 693), is amended by adding at the end thereof a paragraph to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C. 661 and the following), or any other provision of law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to prescribe the rates of pay for the following positions at Veterans' Administration installations in the field: (1) Hospital attendant, (2) dental mechanic, (3) orthopedic mechanic, and (4) positions classified in the crafts, protective, and custodial service pursuant to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That in no case shall the range of rates prescribed for the position be lower than the range of rates prescribed for the same position by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES NAVAL TRAINING STATION, GREAT LAKES, ILL.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6958) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act, 1944, as amended, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to transfer to the Navy Department without exchange of funds all of the lands at the naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill., which the Navy Department now occupies under revocable permit from the Veterans' Administration, except the portion thereof which lies between the Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad and Morrow Avenue, together with all improvements thereon; the specific area hereby authorized to be transferred comprising a parcel lying between the Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad and Sheridan Road and a parcel lying north of Morrow Avenue.

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

CONVEYING LANDS TO THE CITY OF CHEYENNE, WYO.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5734) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affais to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo., with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amend-

ment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. RANKIN, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not find myself in agreement with this measure, but under the conditions existing at the present time in regard to the confirmation of this Commission, I feel it is in the best interest of the country to adopt this measure at this time. When the Commissioners took over this project from the War Department in 1946 under the present Atomic Energy Act the primary objective was from a military standpoint. The Commission has met this obligation in its entirety. The recent tests at Eniwetok have proven that this weapon is more powerful and much cheaper than heretofore produced. The research work which has been carried on under the direction of the present Commission for the benefit of humanity is too numerous and much more extensive then I can explain to the Members of this body in the few minutes allotted to me. I have had the opportunity of visiting this operation which today is much larger than the United States Steel Corp. of America and feel that since the Commission has taken over this project that they have done an excellent job. By virtue of the imminent relationship between science and technology the problem is one of great importance to the national welfare. The future development of the physical and biological sciences will be, I hope, in the years to come for the benefit of mankind. In the meantime we must face the fact that we live in a world in which not much progress has yet been made toward achieving stable international relationship. This Commission which has been carrying on this project, in my opinion, carries a heavy responsibility to the American people and their appointments should be carried out under the terms of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. American scientists of which this Commission is composed have shown themselves to be conscientious and discreet in the case of the atomic bomb. I most emphatically say that it has been our good fortune thus far to have had such men to carry out the functions of this important operation. I maintain that the original act should be carried out in regard to these appointments to fulfill the objectives of the 1946 Atomic Energy Act.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I have the same feeling on this bill as expressed by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. I have a further feeling that it is politically motivated, but I am constrained to go along for the same reason as outlined by my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, may I submit that those who support this bill owe the American people a straight answer to one question:

Have the members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission done a good job?

That is what matters here.

If these men have not done a good job, this House would be faithless to its trust if we voted to continue their tenure for 1 minute.

If these men have done a good job—have safeguarded the leadership in the development of this new force for man's benefit—if they have brought these things to pass, then they are not only fit to serve for the two additional years provided for in this bill, they are fit to serve the terms of variable length which the Congress in accordance with sound policy decreed should be installed in 1948. If these men have done a good job, vote down this bill, so that the wise provisions on tenure of Commissioners in the original Atomic Energy Act may apply.

I say Messrs. Lilienthal, Pike, Strauss, Waymack, and Bacher have done a good job, Mr. Speaker.

I say this out of personal knowledge gained through work as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Armed Services Committee of this House.

Let me enumerate some of the accomplishments recorded by this group of able and devoted men in the 17 months since they assumed charge of this Nation's atomic-energy program.

When they took over the project the most important element in it—the technicians and scientists whose work makes production and new discovery of principles possible—was in disrepair. Men were leaving this service; those remaining were confused and uncertain. On the testimony of the scientists themselves, oft-repeated in recent months, these Commissioners have remedied these conditions. Morale is good and growing better. The technical staff is coming up to strength.

They have set in motion a whole series of programs designed to train more technical men and more skillful technical men for future research and production work.

They have nurtured a current research program which is yielding new knowledge of great importance such as the recent first artificial production of mesons in the large cyclotron at the Radiation Laboratory in Berkeley. They have maintained and enhanced the security of physical facilities and of technical information and have disseminated unrestricted technical information to advance science and industry, as directed in the Atomic Energy Act.

They have guided an unremitting—and successful—drive to step up output of fissionable material. As a matter of fact, in furtherance of this operation there is now under way at Hanford in the State of Washington one of the largest peacetime construction programs ever undertaken by this Nation.

With complete fidelity to their charge to hold paramount the common defense and security, they have provided the means and the encouragement which have resulted in the signal advances in atomic weapons development proved out at the recent tests at Eniwetok Atoll. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I was present at one stage of these tests. In addition I have received from the Commission in executive session of the joint committee, a detailed account of the test result. I know whereof I speak.

Mr. Speaker, in this sphere of weapons development and cooperations with the military services, there are a few additional comments to be made. I have an especial interest here because of my membership on two of the committees most intimately concerned and because of my own experience in the armed forces in the last world war.

This interest of mine has led me to observe these phases of atomic energy operations very closely. I can state categorically that all the evidence is that the Commission and the military services have worked closely together with satisfactory results.

It will be recalled that section 2 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act establishes a Military Liaison Committee and provides that the Commission shall keep this committee fully informed of all matters regarding atomic energy and that the committee shall have authority to take an appeal to the Secretaries of War and Navy and finally to the President if at any time it concludes that any proposed action or failure to act on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission is "adverse to the responsibilities" of the armed services. Let me emphasize that the relationship between the Atomic Energy Commission and the armed services have been so amicable and satisfactory that not a single appeal to the President has been necessary under this provision of the act.

The attitude of the armed services is well represented by the statement of Secretary of the Army Royall when he was asked to comment on the bill introduced by Senator WHERRY to turn the atomic energy program back to the military. In this connection, it should also be noted that there have been several bills introduced from time to time to accomplish this result and that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has never seen fit to take any action on them.

My observations at Eniwetok of the field working relationships between the civilian scientists of the Commission and the men of the three services combined into Joint Task Force 7 for the conduct of the weapons tests provided the final proof that there is complete cooperation—and most fruitful cooperation—between the Commission and the military. This was evidenced further by the statements of General Hull, Captain Russell, and Dr. Froman issued at Honolulu May 18. Note the words of these men:

Lt. Gen. John E. Hull, commander, Joint Task Force 7:

It is a tribute to the scientists who were members of the task force that the operation was successful. * * * All of us have been equally impressed with the scientific competence, the technical skill, and the sound judgment of the civilian scientists and technicians assembled for these tests. Our close association has been valuable in many respects and paves the way for continuing and increasing cooperative effort to insure the common defense and security of the people of the United States.

Capt. James S. Russell, United States Navy, test director, Joint Task Force 7:

The support given to the AEC group was complete and without the assistance of military personnel in the technical phases of the operations the test program could not have been carried out.

Dr. Darol K. Froman, scientific director, Joint Task Force 7:

The spirit of cooperation which existed between the military and civilian personnel resulted in the smoothest possible operation. Throughout the whole operation there has not been a single incident which impeded any test or measurement.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Nation stand in the debt of the men comprising the Commission whose leadership has provided such striking results in so many new and strange phases of endeavor. They deserve from this Republic a better reward than is here vouchsafed in this politically motivated bill. The Nation deserves of us much better than the disservice that we would render by enacting this bill which will impede progress in atomic-energy development. Let us rise above partisan considerations; let us take the course of true service to America and speed the progress of this important work by rejecting this bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and the qualifications of the nominee. The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office prior to June 30, 1950, shall expire at midnight on June 30, 1950. The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office after June 30, 1950, shall be 5 years, except that (A) the terms of office of the members first taking office after June 30, 1950, shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, one at the end of 1 year, one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, one at the end of 4 years, and one at the end of 5 years, after June 30, 1950; and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy, occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Each member, except the chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum; and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. No member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the Commission."

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.

House Resolution 679 was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF FREE PASSES TO TIME INSPECTORS OF CERTAIN CARRIERS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2192) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (7) of section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "its officers, surgeons, physicians, and attorneys at law," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "its officers, time inspectors, surgeons, physicians, and attorneys at law."

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

TRAINING OF FILIPINOS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1969) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have an explanation of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely perfects the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 with respect to the training of selected Filipinos—some in public health, some in engineering and highway construction, some in fisheries, coastal survey, and in other fields. The original bill authorized the training of a designated number of Filipinos ranging from 10 to 100 in each of these fields. Most of them were to be brought to this country and trained before July 1, 1948. It proved impossible to do it in so short a time. Therefore, this bill extends the time under which it can be done to July 1, 1950. It does not increase the authorization of appropriations in the original act. It allows us to spread the training over a longer period instead of being so hurried and concentrated as to prevent a good job.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. JUDD. There is no appropriation at all in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. JUDD. That was authorized under title III of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. I would have to look up the hearings to get the exact amount in each category, but this does not increase them.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The Philippine Rehabilitation appropriation was in the bill which makes appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, from the subcommittee of which I am the chairman. I assure the gentleman there is no increase in the appropriation. I cannot tell him the entire amount now because I do not have the information before me, but it does not change the situation as far as money is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman has no idea of what the cost is?

Mr. STEFAN. The money has already been appropriated.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I know; but what is the amount?

Mr. STEFAN. The cost has already been included in the funds that have been appropriated by the House and the Senate for the rehabilitation of the Philippines.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But the gentleman does not know the amount?

Mr. STEFAN. I cannot tell the gentleman what the amount is. It just increases the number of students that are coming and going.

Mr. JUDD. May I say to the gentleman it does not increase the number; it extends the date from July 1, 1948, to July 1, 1950, so a smaller number can be trained each year, approximately 25 a year for 4 years, instead of 50 a year for 2 years. That is the essence of it. It does not increase the total number by a single person.

Mr. STEFAN. And not a cent of money more is required than has already been appropriated.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 305 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows: "The Public Health Service may set up demonstrations and establish training centers in the Philippines; may establish and maintain in the Philippines a school or schools for the purpose of providing practical instruction in public health; and may, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, provide not to exceed 1 year of training in public-health methods and administration, through study at appropriate schools or colleges in the United States and supplementary field work and observation of public-health work, to not more than 90 Filipinos, to be designated by the President of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), and not to exceed 5 months of training in such methods and administration, through field work and observation of public-health work, to not more than 10 additional Filipinos, to be so designated."

SEC. 2. Section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended by adding thereto a subsection numbered (f) and reading as follows:

"(f) Any Filipino who has commenced training or instruction prior to June 30, 1950, as provided in this act, shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, be entitled, insofar as facilities are available, to receive the full course of training or instruction as prescribed by the head of the bureau or agency concerned, and funds appropriated under the authority of this act shall be available for such training or instruction. The number of trainees to be trained each year, as prescribed by the several sections of this act, refers to the number of trainees who may be designated each year by the President of the Philippines and not to the total number of trainees receiving training or instruction in any 1 year."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause on page 1 and on page 2 through line 11 and insert the following:

"That section 302 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized, under such regulations as he may adopt, to provide training for not to exceed 10 Filipino engineers, to be designated by the President of the Philippines from the regularly employed staff of the Philippine Public Works Department and the engineer officers of the armed forces of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), in the construction, maintenance, and highway traffic engineering and control necessary for the continued maintenance and for the efficient and safe operation of highway transport facilities.'

"SEC. 2. Section 305 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) To accomplish such purposes the Public Health Service shall at the earliest practicable time survey the health situation in the Philippines, and is authorized to replace, expand, or install such health services and facilities in the Philippines as are deemed essential to preservation of health, and may assist in the rehabilitation and development of a Philippine quarantine service for prevention of introduction of disease from abroad or from one island to another. The Public Health Service may set up demonstrations and establish training centers in the Philippines; may establish and maintain in the Philippines a school or schools for the purpose of providing practical instruction in public health; and may, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, provide not to exceed 1 year of training in public health methods and administration, through study at appropriate schools or colleges in the United States and supplmentary field work and observation of public health work, to not more than 90 Filipinos, to be designated by the President of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), and not to exceed 5 months of training in such methods and adminstration, through field work and observation of public health work, to not more than 10 additional Filipinos, to be so designated. It may replace equipment and supply reasonably necessary additional equipment, utilizing for this purpose, so far as possible, surplus property, and may recommend to the Commission the repair or construction under the provisions of section 304, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, of buildings deemed essential to the rehabilitation of public health and quarantine functions.'

"SEC. 3. Section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

UTE INDIANS

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2743) providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians or any tribe or band thereof may have against the United States, and for other purposes, approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209), as amended July 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 593), June 22, 1943 (57 Stat. 160), June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 255), and August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049), is hereby amended by adding to section 3 thereof the following: "The court shall, upon a determination of the material issues or upon consent of the parties, enter a separate final judgment for any value of the surface and a subsequent separate final judgment for any value of the subsurface of the land which the court may determine to be the subject matter of case No. 45585 in the United States Court of Claims entitled "Confederated Bands of Ute Indians versus United States of America." Each of the judgments shall be subject to review in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act of February 13, 1929 (ch. 229, 43 Stat. 939), as amended by the act approved May 22, 1939 (ch. 140, 53 Stat. 752; 28 U. S. C. 288). Any value subsequently allowed by the court for the subsurface, when added to any value previously allowed by the court for the surface, shall not exceed the court's determination of the value, if any, of the land, surface, and subsurface, valued as a whole. The parties may compromise or settle in whole or part claims for any of the surface or subsurface values involved, and any settlement or compromise shall be reduced to a separate judgment. The services rendered by the attorney or attorneys in obtaining any judgment shall constitute a separate employment and undertaking involving a single set of services and the court shall award separate compensation for the services rendered in obtaining each separate judgment. Nothing in this act shall be construed to reduce or increase fees payable to counsel in accordance with their duly approved and executed contracts or to preclude their continued representation in any case until paid; nor, with respect to any judgment hereunder, shall this amendment impair or limit any claim, right, defense, or offset otherwise applicable."

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

IMPORTED FERMENTED LIQUORS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6162) to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor, 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, lines 9, 10, and 11, strike out "also be subject to the war excise tax prescribed in section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code" and insert "during the continuance of the war-tax rate on fermented malt liquors prescribed in section 1650, be subject to tax at such rate in lieu of the rate hereinbefore prescribed."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6800) to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide a permit and bond system for users of nonbeverage alcohol. It does not make any change in the net rate of tax paid by these users of nonbeverage alcohol upon withdrawal. It has the unanimous support of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3108 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended—

(a) By amending the heading thereof to read as follows: "Withdrawal of Alcohol Tax-free or at Reduced Rate."

(b) By relettering subsection (d) as "(e)" and by inserting after "tax-free" in such subsection the following: "or as provided in subsection (d)."

(c) By relettering subsection (e) as "(f)."

(d) By inserting in said section a new subsection reading as follows:

"(d) For use in production of medicines or medicinal preparations for internal use, food products, flavors, and flavoring extracts: Alcohol may be withdrawn, under regulations and upon payment of tax at the rate of $3 per proof gallon, from any industrial plant or bonded warehouse for the manufacture or production of medicines or medicinal preparations, intended for internal use, food products, flavors, or flavoring extracts, which are unfit and not intended for intoxicating beverage purposes."

SEC. 2. That section 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(m) Same: Withdrawal under permit: Any person withdrawing alcohol under the provisions of section 3108 (d) shall pay special tax as follows: $25 for such withdrawals not exceeding 25 proof gallons a year, $50 for such withdrawals not exceeding 50 proof gallons a year, and $100 for such withdrawals exceeding 50 proof gallons a year."

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

LEON NIKOLAIVICH VOLKOV

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 703) for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov, 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 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to suspend the deportation of Leon Likolaivich Volkov for a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA SCHWARTZ AND BESSIE SCHWARTZ

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5716) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz, 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:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz, who arrived at the port of New York on May 9, 1947, and that they shall, for all purposes under the immigration laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as immigrants for permanent residence, upon the payment of the visa fee and head tax. The Secretary of State is authorized to instruct the proper control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year in which such quota is available."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 77 OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 6657, to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (b) and (f) of section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 11, sec. 205 (b)), be, and are hereby, amended to read as follows:

"(b) A plan of reorganization within the meaning of this section (1) shall include provisions modifying or altering the rights of creditors generally, or of any class of them, secured or unsecured, either through the issuance of new securities of any character or otherwise; (2) may include provisions modifying or altering the rights of stockholders generally, or of any class of them, either through the issuance of new securities of any character, or otherwise; (3) may include, for the purpose of preserving such interests of creditors and stockholders as are not otherwise provided for, provisions for the issuance to any such creditor or stockholder of options or warrants to receive, or to subscribe for, securities of the reorganized company in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as may be set forth in the plan; (4) shall provide for fixed charges (including fixed interest on funded debt, interest on unfunded debt, amortization of discount on funded debt, and rent for leased railroads) in such an amount that, after due consideration of the probable prospective earnings of the property in light of its earnings experience and all other relevant facts, there shall be adequate coverage of such fixed charges by the probable earnings available for the payment thereof; (5) shall provide adequate means for the execution of the plan, which may include the transfer of any interest in or control of all or any part of the property of the debtor to another corporation or corporations, the merger or consolidation of the debtor with another corporation or corporations, the retention of all or any part of the property by the debtor, the sale of all or any part of the property of the debtor either subject to or free from any lien at not less than a fair upset price, the distribution of all or any assets, or the proceeds derived from the sale thereof, among those having an interest therein, the satisfaction or modification of any liens, indentures, or other similar interests, the curing or waiver of defaults, the extension of maturity dates of outstanding securities, the reduction in principal and/or rate of interest and alteration of other terms of such securities, the amendment of the charter of the debtor, and/or the issuance of securities of either the debtor or any such other corporation or corporations for cash, or in exchange for existing securities, or in satisfaction of claims or rights or for other appropriate purposes; and may deal with all or any part of the property of the debtor; may reject contracts of the debtor which are executory in whole or in part, including unexpired leases; and may include any other appropriate provisions not inconsistent with this section.

"The adoption of an executory contract or unexpired lease by the trustee or trustees of a debtor shall not preclude a rejection of such contract or lease in a plan of reorganization approved hereunder, and any claim resulting from such rejection shall not have priority over any other claims against the debtor because such contract or lease had been previously adopted. The term 'securities' shall include evidences of indebtedness either secured or unsecured, bonds, stock, certificates of beneficial interest therein, certificates of beneficial interest in property, options, and warrants to receive, or to subscribe for, securities. The term 'stockholders' shall include the holders of voting-trust certificates. The term 'creditors' shall include, for all purposes of this section, all holders of claims of whatever character against the debtor or its property, whether or not such claims would otherwise constitute provable claims under this act, including the holder of a claim under a contract executory in whole or in part including an unexpired lease.

"The term 'claims' includes debts, whether liquidated or unliquidated, securities (other than stock and option warrants to subscribe to stock), liens, or other interests of whatever character. For all purposes of this section unsecured claims, which would have been entitled to priority if a receiver in equity of the property of the debtor had been appointed by a Federal court on the day of the approval of the petition, shall be entitled to such priority and the holders of such claims shall be treated as a separate class or classes of creditors. In case an executory contract or unexpired lease of property shall be rejected, or shall not have been adopted by a trustee appointed under this section, or shall have been rejected by a receiver in equity in a proceeding pending prior to the institution of a proeeeding under this section, or shall be rejected by any plan, any person injured by such nonadoption or rejection shall for all purposes of this section be deemed to be a creditor of the debtor to the extent of the actual damage or injury determined in accordance with principles obtaining in equity proceedings. The provisions of section 60 of this Act shall apply to a proceeding under this section. For all purposes of this section any creditor or stockholder may act in person or by an attorney at law or by a duly authorized agent or committee subject to the provisions of subsection (p) hereof. The running of all statutes of limitation shall be suspended during the pendency of a proceeding under this section: *Provided, however,* That such plan of reorganization shall not affect the existing authority of any State or State regulatory agency relating to service, operations or rates. This proviso shall not be construed as restricting any of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act."

"(f) Upon confirmation by the judge, the provisions of the plan and of the order of confirmation shall, subject to the right of judicial review, be binding upon the debtor, all stockholders thereof, including those who have not, as well as those who have, accepted it, and all creditors secured or unsecured, whether or not adversely affected by the plan, and whether or not their claims shall have been filed, and, if filed, whether or not approved, including creditors who have not, as well as those who have, accepted it. Upon confirmation of the plan, the debtor and any other corporation or corporations organized or to be organized for the purpose of carrying out the plan, shall have full power and authority to, and shall put into effect and carry out the plan and the orders of the judge relative thereto, under and subject to the supervision and the control of the judge, the laws of any State or the decision or order of any State authority to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided, however,* That such plan of reorganization shall not affect the existing authority of any State or State regulatory agency relating to service, operations or rates. This proviso shall not be construed as restricting any of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act. The property dealt with by the plan, when transferred and conveyed to the debtor or to the

other corporation or corporations provided for by the plan, or when retained by the debtor pursuant to the plan, shall be free and clear of all claims of the debtor, its stockholders and creditors, and the debtor shall be discharged from its debts and liabilities, except such as may consistently with the provisions of the plan be reserved in the order confirming the plan or directing such transfer and conveyance or retention, and the judge may require the trustee or trustees appointed hereunder, the debtor, any mortgagee, the trustee of any obligation of the debtor, and all other proper and necessary parties, to make any such transfer or conveyance, and may require the debtor to join in any such transfer or conveyance made by the trustee or trustees. Upon the termination of the proceedings a final decree shall be entered discharging the trustee or trustees, and making such provisions as may be equitable, by way of injunction or otherwise, and closing the case. Upon confirmation of a plan the Commission shall, without further proceedings, grant authority for the issue of any securities, assumption of obligations, transfer of any property, sale, consolidation or merger of the debtor's property, or pooling of traffic, to the extent contemplated by the plan and not inconsistent with the provisions and purposes of the Interstate Commerce Act as now or hereafter amended. The provisions of title I and of section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall not apply to the issuance, sale, or exchange of any of the following securities, which securities and transactions therein shall, for the purposes of said Securities Act, be treated as if they were specifically mentioned in sections 3 and 4 of the said Securities Act, respectively: (1) All securities issued pursuant to any plan of reorganization confirmed by the judge in accordance with the provisions of this section; (2) all securities issued pursuant to such plan for the purpose of raising money for working capital and other purposes of such plan; (3) all securities issued by the debtor or by the trustee or trustees pursuant to subdivision (c), clause (3) of this section; (4) all certificates of deposit representing securities of, or claims against, the debtor, with the exception of such certificates of deposit as are issued by committees not subject to subsection (p) hereof. The provisions of subdivision (a) of section (14) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 shall not be applicable with respect to any action or matter which is within the provisions of subsection (p) hereof."

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

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF $50 EACH TO MEMBERS OF RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5355) authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw as much as may be necessary from the fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States arising from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber within the Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota, according to the provisions of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 137), to the credit of the Red Lake Indians in Minnesota, and to make therefrom a per capita payment or distribution of $50 to each of the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of the State of Minnesota, living at the date of the passage of this act, immediately payable upon the passage of this act, under such rules and regulations as the said Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That the money paid to the Indians as authorized herein shall not be subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or other parties: *Provided further*, That before any payment is made hereunder, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota shall, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, ratify the provisions of this act and accept same.

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

AMENDING SECTION 5 OF LAWS RELATING TO NAVIGATION

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2186) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes", approved May 28, 1908, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 104), is amended (1) by striking out the words "yachts belonging to any regularly organized yacht club of the United States", and inserting in lieu thereof "yachts used and employed exclusively as pleasure vessels and belonging to any resident of the United States", and (2) by striking out the words "belonging to any regularly organized yacht club thereof", and inserting in lieu thereof "used and employed exclusively as pleasure vessels."

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

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2621) authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That to the extent and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., the provisions of the act of May 27, 1930 (ch. 340, 46 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 744a–h); the act of June 23, 1934 (ch. 736, 48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744i–n); and Executive Order 6917 dated December 11, 1934, shall apply to the industrial employment and training of prisoners convicted by general courts martial and confined in any institution under the jurisdiction of any department or agency comprising the National Military Establishment.

SEC. 2. Transfer by any department or agency comprising the National Military Establishment to Federal Prison Industries, Inc., without exchange of funds is authorized of any property or equipment suitable for use in carrying out the functions and performing the duties covered by any agreement entered into under section 1 hereof.

SEC. 3. In addition to the members of the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., authorized by section 2 of the act of June 23, 1934 (ch. 736, 48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744j), the President shall appoint an additional member of the Board as a representative of the Secretary of Defense. Such additional member shall serve at the will of the President and without compensation.

SEC. 4. For its own use in the industrial employment and training of prisoners and not for transfer or disposition, transfers of surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 may be made to Federal Prison Industries, Inc., without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

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

PROMOTING INTEREST OF FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT IN IDAHO

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5416) entitled "An act to promote the interest of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project, Idaho, 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 disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That those provisions of the order of the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 6, 1948, which are based on certain recommendations contained in the Report on Conditions Found to Exist on the Fort Hall Irrigation Project and the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho, dated February 26, 1941, and which are described in the said order as made pursuant to the authority contained in the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), are hereby approved pursuant to the provisions of such Act.

"SEC. 2. During such periods as water for the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project may be available in excess of the present duty

of three acre-feet per acre per annum, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion and under regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the delivery of such excess water equally to the project lands in an amount not to exceed five-tenths acre-feet per acre per annum, in addition to the present duty of three acre-feet per acre per annum: *Provided, however,* That any surplus water temporarily available in addition to the three and five-tenths acre-feet per acre per annum may be furnished for use on project lands on terms, conditions, and rates to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 3. The Little Indian Unit containing one thousand one hundred eighty-six and thirty-three one-hundredths acres of irrigable land in townships 2 and 3 south, ranges 36 and 37 east, Boise meridian, within the boundaries of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, is hereby made a part of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project and the lands therein shall have the benefit of, and be subject to, all existing legislation applicable to said project to the same extent as other lands of like ownership and character within the project. The Indian-owned irrigable land in the unit shall be charged with its proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $5.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act. The non-Indian-owned irrigable land of the unit shall be entitled to receive only natural-flow water until a full project water right is acquired for said land through the execution by the owner of a contract, or contracts, providing for the repayment to the United States of like per-acre costs as are charged against the Indian-owned land in the unit. Said charges, as to Indian and non-Indian lands, shall be a first lien against the lands, under the Act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210).

"SEC. 4. The net irrigable area of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project is hereby established as forty-seven thousand and forty-four and sixty-three one-hundredths acres of land, more or less. This area includes the forty-six thousand eight hundred and three and seventy-two one-hundredths acres of land, more or less, shown as the irrigable area of the project by the maps and plats in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act, and the two hundred and forty and ninety-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, included in eight additional tracts of land described as follows: (a) An irregular shaped area in the northeast corner of the east half southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 36, township 5 south, range 33 east, Boise meridian, containing one and seventy one-hundredths acres; (b) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the west half of section 35, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty-eight and seventeen one-hundredths acres; (c) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the south half of section 14, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing forty acres; (d) a portion of the northwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing thirty-three and forty-two one-hundredths acres; (e) Fairview Park in the east half southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter and west half southeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres; (f) the east half northeast quarter northwest quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty acres; (g) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Pocatello lateral in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ninety-seven and sixty-two one-hundredths acres; and (h) the southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter of section 24, township 6 south, range 34, east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres. The above-described tracts of land, together with such lands in the portion of the village of Alameda, lying between the Pocatello lateral and the Oregon Short Line Railroad right-of-way in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, as (notwithstanding their inclusion in the irrigable acreage shown by the maps and plats hereinabove mentioned) have no water right at present, shall be entitled to receive, or to continue to receive, water through pumping operations or by gravity flow, provided the respective owners thereof, within five years from the date of the enactment of this Act, enter into contracts whereby they agree (1) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project construction costs of $18.12 per acre, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act, for such of their lands as do not now have a project water right, (2) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $15.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, for such of their lands as are not now covered by contracts for the repayment of such costs, and (3) to install, maintain, and operate, at their own expense, pumping machinery to lift the water from the project canals or laterals for the irrigation of such of their lands as cannot be supplied by gravity flow. The non-inclusion of the Fort Hall town site within the net irrigable area of the project as hereby established shall not prevent the obtaining of water rights therefor in accordance with the Act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1015, 1025).

"SEC. 5. There is excluded from the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project by the designation of the project area in section 4 of this Act the nine thousand six hundred and seventy acres of tribal, allotted, and non-Indian-owned lands located between Fort Hall and Gibson, Idaho, heretofore authorized to be included in the project by the Act of March 3, 1927 (Ch. 371, 44 Stat. 1398). The construction costs apportioned to the tribal lands so excluded are hereby canceled and the water rights are made available for project use. The water rights for the lands of the several allottees and non-Indian owners within the area so excluded shall not be impaired or affected by reason of such exclusion, but water shall be delivered only at the head of the laterals serving these lands. The respective owners of such lands may make their water rights available for project use, whereupon the construction costs assessed or assessable against their lands with respect to the water rights thus made available shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior. Allottees of lands within the excluded area, or their heirs or devisees, may donate or sell their lands to the tribe or may exchange their lands for assignments of tribal lands within the project area. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, $8,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase by the Secretary of the Interior, in the name of the United States of America in trust for the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation, of one hundred and eighty acres of non-Indian-owned land, with water rights and improvements appurtenant thereto, described as the north half southeast quarter southwest quarter section 13, township 4 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, and south half northeast quarter and north half southeast quarter section 7, township 4 south, range 35 east, Boise meridian, located within the area excluded from the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project by section 4 of this Act.

"SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,995 to compensate the following-named landowners, or their heirs, for work accomplished or for future work necessary in filling, leveling, and otherwise preparing for irrigation the abandoned portion of the old Fort Hall Main Canal within their holdings, in not to exceed the following amounts: Frank E. DeKay, $401; Henry Jensen, $633; Theodore H. Gathe, $654; A. E. Albert, $106; Ezra D. Wilson, $127; J. M. Bistline, $378; Ambrose H. McGuire, $424; Ellen Griffith, $412; C. M. Allen, $116; Olive A. Granden, $184; William Webster, $28; Hiram Faulkner, $114; Williamette Blakeslee, $298; Frank Parker, $99; and Henrietta C. Blakeslee, $21.

"SEC. 7. Pending the construction of a siphon to provide gravity flow water to ninety-six and six-tenths acres of irrigable lands in the southwest quarter section 27, and east half section 28, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, Idaho, which lands have been irrigated by pumping operations over a period of years, the Secretary of the Interior may accept the conveyance by the landowners of the pumping equipment for use of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project and may operate such equipment as a part of said project in order to provide water for the irrigation of such lands; the acceptance of such conveyance being subject to the owners of the lands executing releases to the United States of any and all claims whatsoever due to the pumping operations carried on by such landowners.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to revise and reform, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine to be fair and equitable in all the circumstances affectng the interests of the United States and the contractors, existing contracts between the United States and the Idaho Irrigation District, the Progressive Irrigation District, and the Snake River Valley Irrigation District in Idaho, which contracts provide for certain payments by the districts to the United States for the benefit of works of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project.

"SEC. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for refunds to Indians, or their heirs, the sum of $1,419.55, representing irrigation assessments of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project erroneously made and collected, as follows: Andrew F. Cutler, $153.80; Alice Sorrell Johns, $168.95; Nettie Stinson LaVatta, $146.62; Earl Edmund Cutler, $159.20; Charles Faulkner, $145.25; Josephine LaVatta Rumas, $155.20; May Phyllis LaVatta Brower, $29.90; Leonard I. Cutler, $135.85; Effie Diggie Houtz, $122.75; Lucy Yandell Spencer, $25; Charles Gerard Cutler, $121.53; and Hattie Sorrell Siler Tillotson, $55.50.

"SEC. 10. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the relocating, rehabilitating, cleaning, and extending of irrigation systems serving the lands irrigated from Ross Fork, Bannock, and Lincoln Creeks, which lands are outside of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, including the construction of a storage reservoir on Bannock Creek. The costs of any work benefiting Indian lands performed pursuant to this authorization shall be apportioned on a per acre basis and collected under laws applicable to Indian irrigable lands on the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project. Operation and maintenance charges against such lands shall likewise be subject to the same laws, rules, and regulations as apply to Indian lands on the Fort Hall project. Any unpaid charges against such lands shall be subject to a first lien as provided in the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210). No expenditure shall be made under this authorization which will benefit lands in non-Indian

ownership unless the owners thereof execute contracts providing for the repayment of their proportionate per acre share of the costs of the work assessable against their lands.

"SEC. 11. In order to prevent the accumulation of delinquent project assessments or other charges against the non-Indian-owned lands of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause liquidation of all delinquent assessments or charges by taking such action as may be necessary, including the foreclosure of the Government's lien covering any such delinquent charges or by initiating such other procedure as may be legally available, which action may be taken by him at any time when in his judgment the best interests of the project would be served thereby.

"SEC. 12. All Act or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN SANBORN,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

The text of the Senate amendment was designed to accomplish the same results as the provisions of the bill as it passed the House, hence the conferees adopted the language of the bill as it passed the House. It was agreed that the text of the House bill sets forth more clearly what was intended than what was contained in the Senate amendment.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN SANBORN,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROLL OF THE INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) entitled "An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the census roll of the Indians of California provided therein," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HUGH BUTLER,
ZALES N. ECTON,
J. E. MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) entitled "An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the census roll of the Indians of California provided for therein," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The Senate conferees in receding from its amendment restore to the bill the language which it contained when it passed the House.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
F. L. CRAWFORD,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Rudd entitled "Education for the New Social Order," notwithstanding the fact that it is two and one-quarter pages over the regular allowance in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. REGAN (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, June 17, 18, and 19, on account of illness.

THE DRAFT BILL

Mr. MONRONEY. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express the sincere hope that when the conferees bring back the draft bill that the Members of this body will be as brave as the men we expect to draft under it.

ANCHOR DAM, OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING

Mr. BARRETT. 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to clear up a matter in connection with the conference report on the Interior appropriation bill.

On the subject of transfer of the Owl Creek unit, Wyoming, Missouri Basin project, from phase B to phase A in the tabulation of the conference committee report, Interior Department appropriation bill, H. R. 6705, on page 8788, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, the Owl Creek unit appears under phase B, units being prepared for construction, with the amount of $200,000 approved by the conferees. It is understood that when the amount of $200,000 was inserted by the House appropriations subcommittee, the intention was to start construction of this development through initiation of work on Anchor Dam. The hearings before the House and Senate committees show that the Bureau of Reclamation has completed preliminary or preconstruction work on Anchor Dam, the major feature of the Owl Creek unit, and the $200,000, if allowed, would be used to initiate construction.

In order that the Bureau of Reclamation may have guidance with respect to the intention of the Congress in connection with the Owl Creek unit, the record should show that it is the understanding of the House that the item "Owl Creek, Wyo., $200,000—amount approved by conferees" on page 8845 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17 should appear under "Phase A, units selected for construction" rather than under "Phase B, units being prepared for construction." I feel sure that this was an oversight on the part of the efficient assistants of the conferees in making up the report and the question is raised at this time so that there may be no misunderstanding of the place this unit has in the Missouri Basin program. Inadvertently, this was not brought to the attention of the committee of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is chairman, and I therefore desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa what position he and his committee take on this matter.

Mr. JENSEN. Since this matter has been brought to my attention, I can assure the gentleman from Wyoming that the committee will be happy to concur in the Bureau of Reclamation request to bring this project into phase A construction.

A HUNDRED THINGS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT COMMUNISM

Mr. MUNDT. 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 Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to call to the attention of the Members of the House the answer to the question which I have been asked frequently in the past 48 hours; that is, whether or not you can secure extra copies of this new publication of the House Committee on Un-American Activities,

entitled "A Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism."

I am pleased to announce we are making arrangements to have printed 500,000 extra copies of this factual document. They will be distributed to the public through the House document room in the normal manner, which will mean that about 1,000 copies will be available to each of you. If you do not care to distribute those copies in your own districts, perhaps you can make them available to your senatorial colleagues or to Members from other States, where these handbooks are in great demand.

This handbook on communism grows out of 10 years of research by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and its able staff and gives the specific, direct answers to 100 important questions about communism, how it operates in the United States of America and what its purposes are in this Republic.

MONTANA PUMPING UNIT, MISSOURI BASIN PROJECT

Mr. D'EWART. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, on the subject of transfer of the Montana pumping unit, Missouri Basin project, from phase B to phase A in the tabulation of the conference committee report, Interior Department appropriation bill, H. R. 6705, on page 8845, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, the Montana pumping unit is included under phase B, units being prepared for construction. This appears to be an error and this unit should be included under phase A. The basis for this inquiry is the statement made on page 6637 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 27 in a colloquy between Mr. D'EWART of Montana and Chairman JENSEN of the House Appropriations Subcommittee. In that colloquy Chairman JENSEN stated "When we marked up the bill we meant to bring a certain portion of this money which we had approached in phase B for the Montana pumping item and also for the Lower Marias, to bring it out of phase B up into phase A, which is construction." The chairman stated then that he had conferred with other members of the committee and "we now recommend that such part of the amount allowed for these projects as may be necessary shall be available for phase A, or, in other words, construction." Since it is the understanding that the Bureau of Reclamation will follow the break-down by projects of the amounts approved by the conferees under the Missouri Basin item, it is suggested that the record should be clarified so as to transfer the item: "Montana pumping, Montana, $210,000—amount approved by conferees" from phase B to phase A.

The first subunit under the Missouri Basin pumping unit will be the N-Bar-N ranch development which will be an important pilot irrigation undertaking in this area. It is hoped that the Bureau of Reclamation will press the construction of this subunit which will have an important bearing on guiding future developments in the Missouri River Basin.

The conferees on the part of the House are to be congratulated on the excellence of their work in maintaining the major part of the results of their able and earnest efforts to advance reclamation along sound lines.

Mr. JENSEN. It is the intention of the committee that that project be advanced from phase B to phase A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I was given permission to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by the Honorable W. Calvin Wells to the Mississippi State Bar Convention.

I am advised by the Public Printer that this exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and that the cost is $301.75. Notwithstanding the cost I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

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

TOM LINDER, J. E. MacDONALD, AND BOB HARRIS

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, it seems strange indeed that the Department of Justice has overlooked so many Power Trust lobbyists, railroad lobbyists, and other big interest lobbyists that have infested this Capitol for the last 6 months, and indicted Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia; J. E. MacDonald, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Texas; and Robert M. Harris, a cotton farmer and merchant, for their efforts to boost the price of cotton, which the farmers sold for about 50 or 60 percent of its normal value last year.

Mr. Harris is a Louisiana planter who is also engaged in the cotton business. He is a cotton merchant; but he seems to be always on the bull side of the market; that is, he is in favor of raising the price of cotton instead of holding it down.

Now, if the time has come with a commissioner of agriculture of a southern State cannot exert his efforts to keep the buyers from beating down the price of cotton and plundering the farmers of the South of untold millions of dollars, I say we have reached a poor pass.

Why not indict some of these lobbyists who are here trying to wreck this country, or trying to ram through legislation that they know is detrimental to welfare of the American people.

Tom Linder and J. E. MacDonald are two outstanding men of the South as far as the cotton farmers of this country are concerned.

They have exerted every effort to see that the southern farmers received a fair price for their cotton, and I cannot see the justice of prosecuting them for such efforts, especially since they have been elected by the people of their respective States for that purpose.

TOM LINDER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in what the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has just said about the indictment of Tom Linder in Georgia. We in South Carolina across the river from Georgia admire the great stand of Tom Linder, of Georgia, in behalf of the cotton farmers and, indeed, of the farmers of every State of the 48 States of this Union. Possibly I am wrong but it appears to me the Attorney General could find plenty of people who should be indicted without bringing charges against a man who is obligated by virtue of his election as commissioner of agriculture to fight for the rights of his people before committees of this Congress and elsewhere. I do not believe Mr. Linder has made this fight for personal gain. I believe the courts will prove this.

Tom Linder has done a good job for the farmers of the South. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that if they are going to indict anyone, why not indict some of these big monopolies, these big trusts, lobbyists for displaced persons and foreign loans here in Washington and not come down into the sovereign State of Georgia and indict the commissioner of agriculture of a great and sovereign State.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include, first, an article entitled "American Taxpayers Finance Communist Students," second, an article entitled "More on State Department Act," and, third, an article from the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Banking and Currency Committee.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes following any previous special orders for the day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish again to remind the House that there is pending before the Rules Committee an extremely fine veterans' housing bill, H. R. 4488, the only bill that will really give housing to the veteran. The bill passed today does not take care of the veterans; it is not a veterans' housing bill. It is a general housing bill. They have to take their chance with everybody else. There is no priority for veterans, as I understand the bill.

In all of our discussions on the question of housing legislation there is one fundamental fact which too many of us overlook. We tend to forget the fact that the housing problem is primarily a veterans' housing problem. We are forgetting the pledges we made to our demobilized veterans that we would do something about their housing problem. The suffering caused by the present housing shortage is not equally distributed—our former GI's are bearing the brunt of it.

There is ample evidence that the average veteran family is already priced far out of the market for new homes. The high rate of home building is an excellent achievement, but let us not delude ourselves that these homes are going to our veteran constituents. They simply cannot afford them.

The general housing legislation we are considering will not improve this situation. Except for the public-housing provisions, which will conceivably prove helpful to only a small segment of veterans in the metropolitan centers, the general housing bill will merely continue a status quo in which the veteran has no real preference.

It is time for us to live up to our pledges and to pass a housing bill which will really help our veterans. I am convinced that H. R. 4488, the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, is that bill. The veterans' homestead bill has the sponsorship of the American Legion and was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is the only legislation I know of which will really give the veteran a break in the housing market.

It will give them homes at much lower cost. Through FWA grants and other features, the bill will reduce housing costs to veterans by as much as 20 percent. Unlike the general housing bill, which would give aid to the bottom 10 percent of our income groups through public housing, and to the top 10 percent through its other provisions, the veterans homestead bill is aimed squarely at the home-seeking veterans in the middle 80 percent.

It will give veterans the tools to master their housing problem through their own initiative. Through homestead associations chartered by the Veterans' Administration, veterans can go ahead in their own communities and build their homes without having to rely on the efforts of others.

It assures veterans of the necessary financing. Through loans from the Veterans' Administration and through provisions which assure the availability of an adequate supply of capital for GI loans, home-seeking veterans can be certain of low-cost financing.

It will solve the rental-housing problem which is plaguing our veterans in urban centers. Homestead associations can begin immediately to build apartment houses which will feature greatly reduced monthly rentals.

It provides the very necessary aid to GI's who need farms. By making low-cost credit available to veterans through the Federal land banks and the Farmers Home Administration, the bill will answer a crying need in our farm communities where veterans are now unable to get the necessary financing to buy a farm.

These are the compelling advantages offered to veterans by the homestead bill. Now as to legislative cost. I have heard opponents of the bill say, "The bill is all well and good, but won't its cost to the taxpayers be prohibitive?" The answer is an emphatic "No."

The great bulk of the funds made available under the Homestead bill will not be expenditures at all, but will be self-liquidating loans which will be repaid to the Government with interest. The only direct cost involved is the $200,000,000 for FWA grants for land development and public utilities, and even this cost will be spread over a number of years. I think that all of us who have helped to develop the Homestead bill can well be proud that it will accomplish so much at so little cost. It certainly seems the least we can do to help our deserving veterans solve their housing problem.

A broken pledge is a terrible thing. Let us keep faith with our veterans and give them this Homestead bill. It is the only way we can make amends for our shameful neglect of the veterans' housing problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as a part of my remarks an editorial taken from this morning's Washington Times-Herald, which is as follows:

GOOD LUCK, CONGRESS! SEE YOU NEXT JANUARY

As this was written it was pretty nearly in the cards, that Congress will leave here in another 48 hours not to return until January 1949, so here is a sort of vital-statistics round-up on the job it has done.

A FINE RECORD

To begin with, this is the Eightieth Congress since the founding of the Republic. It came into being with the elections of November 1946, and took office on January 3, 1947, for its first session. On July 27, 1947, it recessed and went home to check with the public, returning November 17. This present session convened January 6, 1948, and closes June 19, 1948.

The Eightieth Congress has done an outstanding job, all things considered, and the taxpayers have got more than their money's worth out of it.

So this Congress has a right to its present cocky, cheerful confidence that the taxpayers will call on the Eighty-first Congress for more of the same from just about the same representation in House and Senate when it convenes here on January next.

Looking over the record in detail, we figure the main weaknesses of the Eightieth Congress about as follows:

It leaves the country without universal military training and regardless of whatever so-called draft it turns out in these last hours, this was a terrible mistake.

WEAK SIDE

We live in an age of wars and in such an age there is no substitute for a trained military manpower. A draft, as such, is only a stopgap until UMT can really polish up our fighting Reserves for instant service when needed. The Eightieth Congress laid down on that job, largely because it was intimidated by mothers, college professors, and professional pacifists. To do so was an invitation to national disaster.

The Eightieth also made a boner, we think, in not passing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. Senator TAFT was able to get this long-range project through the Senate but the House flopped. Here's hoping the Eighty-first Congress puts it into law, and for that matter all the rest of Senator TAFT's lay-out of improvements in social security, education, and public medicine.

Taken all together, these are a program of national self-improvement that the United States of America could use and nobody we know of equals TAFT as a master at designing the laws to carry out such a program.

On the good side, the Eightieth has a really stellar record. First, as to national defense, it has put up the necessary cash by the billions for research and improvements of weapons—lands, sea, and air.

GOOD SIDE

It has forced the Army, Navy, and Air Force to work on a long overdue internal reorganization that will undoubtedly be valuable both to economy and efficiency. It has kept its head about the atom bomb, in spite of many tensions and some real mistakes, such as last year's senatorial confirmation of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Eightieth has also faithfully reorganized its own system of doing business along the lines drawn up by the Seventy-ninth Congress and has started a high-powered Commission to studying the executive branch for reorganization as well. The Commission will report to the Eighty-first Congress next January, and great hopes are held for better government at less cost.

On taxes, the Eightieth has done about as good a job as anybody had a right to expect, having got through some cut-backs of a modest sort over the Presidential veto, as at least a token of intention, if not as a real return of the people's money to the people.

On labor, there is the Taft-Hartley law working smoothly after all and helping the unions keep out of trouble.

On foreign affairs, the Eightieth yielded to the pressure for the multibillioned ERP gamble, but at least has had the wit to form up a team of its own specialists to watchdog the Executive. Thanks for that, anyhow.

On veterans' needs it has done such a good job that it has won high praise from even Commander Ty Krum, the Times-Herald's editor of veterans' affairs, who has put in many hours of work with Speaker JOE MARTIN.

But, as of this writing, the House was past due on one piece of veterans' legislation that passed the Senate a year ago and that is the bill to provide cars for combat-disabled men of World War II so they can get out and make a decent living. There is still time for the bill to go into law and it should.

POLITICAL PROSPECTS

Considering the record, what is the political outlook for the Members of the Eightieth Congress? How is the country likely to feel about reelecting them?

Well, first it has to be noted that the Eightieth Congress has been a Republican Congress, working upstream against the stubborn, often frantic disruptions of a tail-end Democratic regime headed up by a man who was never elected to the Presidency.

Congress has done its work wonderfully well against the sniping of Mr. Truman's team and has not only won most of its battles but has kept its dignity and prestige.

Of course we could be wrong, but right now it looks like a sure thing to say that the Eighty-first Congress, like the Eightieth, will be orgarrized by the Republican majority

and will also have the satisfaction of working with a Republican President.

Good-bye, Congress. Good luck. Hope most of you come back next January.

Mr. Speaker, if the so-called veterans' amputee car bill that has already passed the Senate does not pass the House, I shall feel that everything that is being said in the House about caring for our disabled veterans is a hollow mockery. These veterans are the combat disabled, the blind and the amputees, among the worst disabled of all of our veterans. It costs very little. The Senate in its wisdom and kindness passed it last year. There is no excuse for not passing this legislation. We have just passed a bill which I myself introduced to build a hospital in the Philippines. We have a legal and a moral obligation to do that. But I remind the House that countless billions have been sent to foreign countries, millions of dollars of automobiles have been sent to foreign countries. This bill costs only a pittance. These veterans are the boys we sent to war. There are a few Members who have been disabled as these boys have been. They know what an automobile can do as a rehabilitation measure.

Mr. Speaker, I feel so strongly about the matter that if by any chance it should not pass, I plan to tour the entire country to see that in the next session it does pass. It cannot fail.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

REDUCING THE COST OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress approaches a close, I wish to say a few words with respect to the work of the Congress in the matter of reducing the cost of government.

Inasmuch as the House has acted on all the appropriation bills, except for a final deficiency bill, I recognize that what I might say at this time will have little, if any, influence on the final record of the Congress in achieving economy. Nonetheless, I feel justified in taking this time in order that the record may be clear, at least insofar as I am personally concerned as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, on what has been accomplished and what we have failed to accomplish.

At the moment no one knows what the final figures will show as to the actual savings realized by this Congress in the various operations of the Federal Government. Indeed, a major question yet to be decided is the amount to be appropriated for the foreign-aid program. I am most hopeful that the views of the House, reducing the amount to be appropriated, will prevail over the views of the Senate, which is insisting upon the full amount.

As is true in every election, there are many factors that prompted the American people to elect this Republican Congress. One of the reasons, and I think a very compelling reason with the majority of the American people, was the fact that the Republicans gave promise of reducing the cost of Government, of eliminating the waste and the extravagance, and of placing our economy on a sound fiscal basis.

This Congress did not break that pledge. As a rough estimate, the Congress has saved approximately $6,000,000,000 in these 2 years of its existence. When one considers the difficulties that have been involved in accomplishing this saving, the determined opposition we faced from the administration, it represents a very substantial achievement. It is because of this saving that we have been able to give our people much-needed tax relief.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I fully appreciate how hard it has been to realize economy. We have had absolutely no cooperation from the executive branch of the Government. And, as has been demonstrated time and again here on the floor of the House, we have had consistent opposition by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle.

It should be borne in mind that the President did not present to the Congress his major budget requests when the Congress opened. It was not until May 26 that our committee received the final budget estimates for the Army and the Air Force, and it was not until June 1 that we received the estimates for the Navy.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have been proceeding under great handicaps in trying to accomplish a thorough job of realizing economy. I appreciate that fact. I know what our committee has been up against. While I do not for a moment detract from what has been accomplished, I wish to say that for myself I believe much more could have been accomplished.

I rise at this time to utter a word of warning, Mr. Speaker. We are rapidly approaching a crisis in Federal expenditures. As I have said on several occasions on this floor, when the various appropriation bills were before us, it is always easier to spend than to save; every proposed expenditure has a political appeal. It is perfectly evident to me, and I believe to the vast majority of the American people, that the only way to cut Government spending is to cut it. It takes political courage, but that is the kind of courage we must have if we are to maintain financial stability.

Let me emphasize this fact: if the fiscal system of the United States weakens, the whole civilized world will follow. The weakening of our financial foundation, upon which our system of free competitive enterprise rests, will do more to serve the enemies of our way of life than any weapon that could be devised. The liberty-loving people of the world are dependent upon our strength. For my part, I do not believe that we can remain strong when the Government, Federal, State, and local, eats up about 30 percent of the incomes of all Americans.

One of the major achievements of this Congress was the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. For approximately a year that Commission has been engaged in a thorough, over-all survey of all the operations of the Government. It will probably make its report when the new Congress assembles. It is a nonpartisan Commission, and it has proceeded in a nonpartisan manner.

The fact that this Commission exists and that it is composed of such outstanding men gives me some hope. It gives me hope that when the new Congress meets we will be in a position to do the kind of a job that should be done toward bringing order out of chaos in Federal operations and expenditures.

Former President Herbert Hoover is serving as Chairman of this Commission. That he and his colleagues recognize the absolute necessity of dealing realistically and thoroughly with this problem of Government expenditures and the need for complete reorganization is evidenced from the following paragraph in a letter he wrote last month concerning the work of his Commission:

> That it is imperative is obvious when we consider that the number of persons at 3 years after the First World War who were receiving regular payments from the Federal Government was about 2,200,000, and 3 years after the Second World War it is about 13,400,000. The budget 3 years after the First World War was about $4,000,000,000 per annum, whereas 3 years after the Second World War it is $40,000,000,000. There are insufficient savings left in the hands of the people to repair, maintain, and improve the tools of production and distribution upon which our standard of living depends. These figures obviously indicate the necessity for important structural changes in the Government to secure the maximum efficiency and economy.

But however thorough a study this Commission may make of the subject, however sound its final report may prove to be, it will all be meaningless unless we have in Congress men and women who are determined to carry through an economy program. As I said before, we have accomplished much during this Congress; but speaking for myself, I do not believe we accomplished nearly enough.

It is my conviction that the American people earnestly desire to see our Government on a sound fiscal basis, that they earnestly desire to see the cost of government reduced, that they earnestly desire to be relieved of the burdensome taxes that have been destroying initiative and eating up our productive substance. I hope—I sincerely hope—that when the people go to the polls this November they will elect a truly economy-minded Congress and an economy-minded President.

We greatly need, both in the White House and in Congress, men and women who do not simply talk economy, then vote for an increase in this appropriation and that because it may be politically wise or expedient. We need a determined, courageous economy program. Without such a program, I fear for our national solvency.

We have made a beginning, but it is only a beginning toward restoring sanity and order in Government. I am sure the people will wholeheartedly support an all-out economy program. To such a program I stand committed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4071. An act to amend section 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 239. An act to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 19, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1660. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 18, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Manistique Harbor, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 19, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 721); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1661. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 10, 1948, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Oswego Harbor, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 722); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1662. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 1, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., in the vicinity of Fairfield, N. C., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 28, 1944, and also in partial response to resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on April 20, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 723); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1663. A letter from Charles E. Bohlen, counselor, for the Secretary of State, transmitting lists indicating the dismantling and shipping status of all plants listed for reparation in the French zone and, for all plants other than war plants for which estimates are feasible, their character and capacity, as requested under the second and third questions of House Resolution 365; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1664. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year ending December 31, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

1665. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to settle and extinguish land claims to the public domain in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1666. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, and the Annual Report of the City of New York covering operations of foreign-trade zone No. 1 during the calendar year 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 678. Resolution authorizing the printing of the volume entitled "The Democratic Way and the Totalitarian Way" as a House document; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2401). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2402). Referred to the Union Calendar.

Mr. BENDER: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 686. Resoluation providing for the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2403). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 684. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of part No. 2 of the final majority report of the Joint Committee on Housing entitled "Statistics of Housing"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2404). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 672. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 403; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2405). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 199. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (H. Rept. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence; with amendments (Rept. No. 2406). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on relation of new functions and activities of departments and agencies; to increased civilian employment in the executive branch; without amendment (Rept. No. 2412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 580. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; without amendment (Rept. 2413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota; without amendment (Rept. No. 2414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 691. Resolution authorizing the appointment of a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organizations, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission; without amendment (Rept. 2415). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2416. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2417. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 654. Resolution to provide additional funds for the conduct of the investigation continued by House Resolution 153; without amendment (Rept. No. 2420). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 213. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee, current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law; without amendment (Rept. No. 2421). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 676. Resolution to provide further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 298, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 2422). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 674. Resolution providing for the further expenses of the studies and investigations conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 404, Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2423). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 655. Resolution authorizing the printing of the fifteenth report of the Commission on Fine Arts as a House document with illustrations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2424). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 675. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the Joint Committee on Housing for the purpose of concluding its business; without

amendment (Rept. No. 2425). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 646. Resolution to print the prayers offered by the Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, 1945–48; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2426). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 600. Resolution to provide for the expenses of carrying out House Resolution 595; with amendments (Rept. No. 2427). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 677. Resolution for the relief of Evelyn Richardson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2407). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 692. Resolution relative to the contested election case of Wilson versus Granger, First Congressional District of Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 2418). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 6981. A bill to improve methods of wine production, to correct inequities in the revenue law with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 6982. A bill to provide for the calling of a governors' conference by the President of the Senate; for certain changes in the rules of the Senate and House of Representatives; to authorize certain expenditures consequent thereon; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6983. A bill to amend section 719 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to borrowed invested capital; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 6984. A bill extending the time to file claims for refund of income taxes paid on certain compensation received for military or naval service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POTTER (by request):

H. R. 6985. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative decisions declaring forfeit veterans' benefits; to the committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 6986. A bill to provide that certain mortages and loans shall not be eligible for insurance or guaranty under the National Housing Act or the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 unless a warranty is provided against structural and other defects in construction of the dwelling involved; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. R. 6987. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 6988. A bill to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6989. A bill to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 6990. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. J. Res. 432. Joint resolution providing for an investigation of the effect of certain conventions and treaties between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and the Dominion of Canada relating to the protection and preservation of certain species of migratory birds, waterfowl, and game mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 434. Joint resolution to suspend the operation of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. Res. 691. Resolution authorizing the appointment of a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 693. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6958; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 694. Resolution providing for the further expenses for conducting the study and inspection authorized by House Resolution 120 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6991. A bill for the relief of Hampton Institute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6992. A bill for the relief of the estate of James J. Barnett, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6993. A bill for the relief of Leonid Zankowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6994. A bill for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6995. A bill to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6996. A bill for the relief of the Montana Engineering & Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 6997. A bill for the relief of Ferd Owen, Berdie Owen, Gilbert Good, Lela Owen Good, Audie Owen, Wayne Owen, Art Owen, Has Owen, Marvin Owen, and Gene Owen, doing business as Owen Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6998. A bill for the relief of Janos and Marianne Mero Somogyi; 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:

2112. By Mr. SABATH: Memorial of the City Council of the City of Chicago, memorializing Congress to provide appropriations for the operation of air-traffic control towers by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in cities throughout the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2113. By the SPEAKER: Petition of New York Teachers Chapter, American Veterans Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2114. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of Dr. and Mrs. Frank E. Becker, containing 1,215 signatures, including those of 223 residents of Staten Island, N. Y., urging the appropriation by the Congress of sufficient funds for the education and general rehabilitation of the Navajo Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 15, 1948)

(Continuation of Senate proceedings of Friday, June 18, 1948, from 1:45 a. m. on Saturday, June 19, 1948.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some months ago, while I was absent because of illness in my family, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] took occasion not only to attack me personally at that time but also to attack the conduct of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Tonight I hold in my hand a statement made last evening during the temporary absence of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, in 1933, when the Democrats came into office, the record shows they did not confirm one single postmaster. The record shows further that President Hoover made a personal appeal to President Roosevelt for the single purpose of getting even Walter Newton, his former secretary——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to make the point that the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will please be seated so we can hear the speech by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Even the desperate personal appeal of former President Hoover merely to have one single Democrat, Walter Newton, confirmed as judge was denied.

Mr. President, in contrast, I want to show the fine and splendid cooperative attitude of the Republican Party. I have here in my hand the nominations that were on the calendar for June 15. Postmasters were confirmed for the States of Connecticut, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jer-