want the communistic officials cleaned out and sentenced; further, they want the Defense Council and its Secretary Johnson disbanded immediately as illegal and contrary to constitutional law; and they want the Vinson and Tydings bills turned down; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1121. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Boy Scouts of America, New York, N. Y., relative to the thirty-ninth annual meeting held in Boston, Mass., and expressing their appreciation to Members of both Houses of Congress for the cooperation and support which have been extended during the last year; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1122. Also, petition of J. Horton and others, Indianapolis, Ind., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1123. Also, petition of the American Municipal Association, Chicago, Ill., urging immediate passage of the national housing bill, H. R. 4009; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1124. Also, petition of Pennsylvania Junior Chamber of Commerce, Lancaster, Pa., endorsing the findings of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1125. Also, petition of Milwaukee County Dental Society, Milwaukee, Wis., requesting the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1126. Also, petition of State Medical Association of Texas, Austin, Tex., relative to compulsory health insurance as championed by the present administration, and conveying to their central organization wholehearted support and cooperation, both financially and morally, in its educational campaign; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1127. Also, petition of Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, Camden, N. J., relative to the Railway Labor Act union-security provisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, once more, in Thy great mercy, the white scroll of a new day unfolds before us. We pray that this day our record may be kept unstained by any word or act unworthy of our best.

Give us this day our daily bread, not only of physical renewal but of spiritual sustenance, lest our souls starve in the far country of neglect or indulgence.

For our own sake and for the sake of the Nation whose servants we are called to be, and of a needy world in this desperate day, lead us along the paths of righteousness to still waters and green pastures where our strained and jaded spirits may be restored by Thy redeeming grace.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 21, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 21, 1949, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1129) to amend section 16–416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to conform to the nomenclature and practice prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 559. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Central Division of the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the city of Needles, Calif., and the California-Pacific Utilities Co.;

H. R. 571. An act for the relief of Bankers & Shippers Insurance Co.;

H. R. 632. An act for the relief of John E. Burns;

H. R. 1017. An act for the relief of John Aaron Whitt;

H. R. 1019. An act for the relief of George M. Ford;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of the Jansson Gage Co.;

H. R. 1054. An act for the relief of the Riegel Textile Corp.;

H. R. 1055. An act for the relief of Agnese R. Mundy;

H. R. 1282. An act for the relief of Mrs. T. A. Robertson;

H. R. 1458. An act for the relief of Joseph R. Gregory;

H. R. 1601. An act for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc.;

H. R. 1782. An act for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grissinger;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Charles E. Ader;

H. R. 1795. An act for the relief of Lewyt Corp.;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of the estate of Josephine Pereira;

H. R. 2090. An act for the relief of Sam Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Alethea Arthur;

H. R. 2095. An act for the relief of the estate of Kenneth N. Peel;

H. R. 2253. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur Earl Troiel, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 2456. An act for the relief of Charlie Hales;

H. R. 2530. An act for the relief of James R. Frazer;

H. R. 2592. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John White Bear a patent in fee to certain lands;

H. R. 2706. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Susie Larvie Dillon;

H. R. 2806. An act for the relief of Paul C. Juneau;

H. R. 2807. An act for the relief of Loretta B. Powell;

H. R. 2848. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 2920. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to George Swift Horse;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Ida Hoheisel, executrix of the estate of John Hoheisel;

H. R. 3139. An act for the relief of James B. DeHart;

H. R. 3408. An act for the relief of Opal Hayes and D. A. Hayes;

H. R. 3501. An act for the relief of Nelson Bell;

H. R. 4254. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Sidney Blackhair;

H. R. 4466. An act removing certain restrictions imposed by the act of March 8, 1888, on certain lands authorized by such act to be conveyed to the trustees of Porter Academy;

H. R. 4804. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker; and

H. R. 5018. An act for the relief of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Linzay;

H. R. 1125. An act for the relief of Ellis C. Wagner and Barbara P. Wagner;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of June C. Dollar; and

H. R. 4471. An act to regulate the hours of duty and the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Holland	Maybank
Anderson	Humphrey	Miller
Baldwin	Hunt	Morse
Brewster	Ives	Mundt
Butler	Jenner	Murray
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Chavez	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Downey	Langer	Taft
Eastland	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Lucas	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Tobey
George	McClellan	Vandenberg
Gillette	McFarland	Watkins
Graham	McGrath	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young
Hoey	Martin	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the Delegation of the United States of America to the Second World Health Organization Assembly to convene at Rome, Italy.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent on official business, presiding at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with an investigation of the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of illness.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are in attendance at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained because of their attendance at a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations.

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made:

The members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are in attendance at a meeting of the said committee in connection with an investigation of the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials and place other routine matters into the RECORD, without debate, as though we were in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without ob- referred as indicated:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation amending section 2 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449) to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the National Bureau of Standards, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPEAL OF SECTION 205, TITLE II, FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 205 of title II of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1949, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Two letters from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved, together with a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provision of law and the reason for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY ASSOCIATED COOPERATIVES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., for the period July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Washtenaw County Democratic Committee, Ann Arbor, Mich., signed by Lewis L. Forsythe, chairman, relating to appropriations for foreign aid; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Lee Comer, of St. Augustine, Fla., relating to a reduction in governmental expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Psychiatric Association, signed by Daniel Blain, M. D., medical director, of Washington, D. C., relating to an increase of appropriations for the World Health Organization program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Building-Residential Contractors Association, signed by Francis A. Rogers, president, relating to housing for the average American family; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania Junior Chamber of Commerce, of Lancaster, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation recommended by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Resolutions adopted by the Sisterhood of Congregation Tifereth Israel, of Glen Cove, N. Y., and the Yeshiva of Hartford, Hartford, Conn., protesting against the enactment of legislation which would change the present calendar; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Christians-Baptist, Veterans Welfare Association, of Chicago, Ill., relating to a national charter for that organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Francis M. Jenkins, of Lebanon Junction, Ky., relating to unemployment caused by increased size of locomotive and length of trains on railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the American Psychiatric Association, of Detroit, Mich., signed by Leo H. Bartemeir, M. D., secretary, relating to the program of the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Syracuse (N. Y.) Dental Society, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the West Virginia Legislative Committee of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, of Parkersburg, W. Va., relating to parcel-post rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the West Virginia State Legislative Committee of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, of Parkersburg, W. Va., relating to amendments of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the West Virginia State Legislative Committee, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, of Parkersburg, W. Va., relating to the proposed repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Military Order of Foreign Wars of the United States, National Commandery, of Washington, D. C., favoring the early ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, favoring the enactmentof Senate bill 1387 and House bill 3787, providing that the proposed veterans' hospital at West Haven, Conn., be officially known and designated on the public records as the John D. Magrath Memorial Veterans' Hospital after the East Norwalk, Conn., youth of that name who was killed in action on April 14, 1945, and was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on June 20, 1949, p. 7892, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. Mabel D. Price, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Zephyrhills, Fla., transmitting a petition of sundry citizens of Florida, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I present the petition, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THE LATE SENATOR J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution

adopted by Burley Auction Warehouse Association, of Mount Sterling, Ky., relating to the death of the late Senator Broughton, of North Carolina, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

BURLEY AUCTION
WAREHOUSE ASSOCIATION,
Mount Sterling, Ky.

RESOLUTIONS UPON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON

The Honorable J. Melville Broughton was born in Raleigh, N. C., on November 17, 1888, the son of Joseph Melville and Sally Harris Broughton.

After receiving his bachelor of arts degree from Wake Forest College, Senator Broughton served as principal of a rural school. During those years he manifested his abiding interest in the youth of our country.

As a reporter on the staff of the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal, Senator Broughton next evidenced those qualities of logic and clarity of thought which characterized his career in all of its many facets.

After attending Harvard Law School in 1912 and 1913 Senator Broughton began his career as a lawyer and as a public servant. He was elected a member of the North Carolina State Senate, the Governor of North Carolina, and a United States Senator.

During these same years Senator Broughton was equally active as a good citizen. A Baptist and a Mason, Senator Broughton was also a member of the board of trustees of Wake Forest College and of the board of trustees of the University of North Carolina.

When Senator Broughton was a candidate for office the majorities accorded him proved again and again the esteem in which he was held by the people of his State. He won more than the respect and admiration of his people; he won their love.

As a public official Senator Broughton was capable, conscientious, and courageous. As an attorney he was successful in his practice and at the same time ever cognizant of his obligations as an officer of the court. His standing in his profession led to his election as president of the North Carolina Bar Association in 1935.

Senator Broughton knew the problems of the man who tills the soil. He was himself a farmer, and a great portion of his time was spent in the service of American agriculture.

Senator Broughton's approach to farm issues was never either selfish or narrow. He strove to improve the lot of the farmer, but he always sought to place the welfare of all of the people above any special interest.

In the death of Senator Broughton farmers, and especially tobacco growers, lost one of their noblest friends; the South lost a distinguished public servant; and the Nation lost one of its greatest men.

Senator Broughton married Miss Alice H. Willson. Four children were born of the marriage. Despite the demands of his profession and of public office, Senator Broughton gave wholeheartedly of his interest, his love, and his devotion to his family.

Senator Broughton possessed a host of friends. He responded to every request for assistance with an obvious conviction that each opportunity for service constituted a rare privilege. With a polished manner, a genuine sense of humor, and an enviable disposition, Senator Broughton was an able and effective leader who accomplished his objectives as a public servant without once assuming a dictatorial power. He possessed that happy disposition of rendering service with a graciousness and a smile that endeared him in the hearts of all.

To the family of Senator Broughton, the members of the Burley Auction Warehouse Association extend their most sincere condolences. We share the bereavement that comes from the loss of so noble a man.

BURLEY AUCTION WAREHOUSE
ASSOCIATION.
ALBERT G. CLAY, *President.*
MABEL G. JONES,
Assistant Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2021. A bill to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 558); and

H. R. 4381. A bill to provide cumulative sick and emergency leave with pay for teachers and attendance officers in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 555).

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1918. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint contracting officers to make contracts in amounts not exceeding $5,000; with amendments (Rept. No. 556); and

H. R. 2104. A bill relating to orders to banks doing business in the District of Columbia to stop payment on negotiable instruments payable from deposits in, or payable at, such banks; with amendments (Rept. No. 557).

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

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on Lobbying Activities; with amendments (Rept. No. 559); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PAYMENT OF COUNSEL FEES IN 1947 MARYLAND SENATORIAL CONTEST

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution relating to the payment of counsel fees in the 1947 Maryland senatorial contest, and I submit a report (No. 554) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 127) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $35,313.37 for the payment of counsel fees incurred in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (O) (1) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider the question whether Mr. HERBERT R. O'CONOR was entitled to retain his seat in the Senate to which he was elected for the term beginning January 3, 1947.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 117, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It provides for $10,000 to print additional hearings required by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 117), submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah on May 13, 1949, and heretofore favorably reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-first Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment, Senate Resolution 126, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 126), submitted by Mr. MCKELLAR on June 9, 1949, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-first Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 93, authorizing an expenditure of $25,000 for investigations by the Committee on Armed Services, and I submit a report (No. 553) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 93), submitted by Mr. TYDINGS on March 24, 1949, and heretofore favorably reported by the Committee on Armed Services, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending December 31, 1950, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR GOVERNMENT PRINTING OUTSIDE THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably House bill 4878, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4878) to authorize certain Government printing, binding, blank-book work elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office, if approved by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to explain the bill. It strikes out of the act of March 1, 1949, the words "than in the District of Columbia for the exclusive use of any field service outside of said District," and adds the following language to existing law:

And (2) printing in field printing plants operated by any such executive department, independent office, or establishment, and the procurement of printing by any such executive department, independent office, or establishment from allotment for contract field printing, if approved by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill, H. R. 4878, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of March 1949, and in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The report is as follows:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941, ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY, MARCH-APRIL 1949

(With special table showing trends in employment—paid and without compensation)

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH MARCH-APRIL 1949, AND PAY FEBRUARY-MARCH 1949

Note with reference to personal service expenditure figures

It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of March, and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of February, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of April and are compared with the month of March. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows personnel employed outside continental United States. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

Personnel and pay summary

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for April 1949 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Pay roll (in thousands of dollars) in executive branch		
	In April numbered—	In March numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In March numbered—	In February numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,122,710	2,111,257	+11,453	$565,906	$509,328	+$56,578
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,226,021	1,215,795	+10,226	326,142	299,571	+26,571
2. National Military Establishment	896,689	895,462	+1,227	239,764	209,757	+30,007
Within National Military Establishment:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,447	1,335	+112	535	439	+96
Department of the Army	374,463	370,903	+3,560	94,732	83,094	+11,638
Department of the Air Force	164,870	162,697	+2,173	44,042	36,241	+7,801
Department of the Navy	355,909	360,527	−4,618	100,455	89,241	+11,214

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number of employees inside continental United States, the number outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further breakdown in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because pay-roll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

Inside continental United States

(See table II)

Federal personnel within the United States increased 13,838 from the March total of 1,919,723 to the April total of 1,933,561.

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was an increase of 9,802 from the March total of 1,159,720 to the April total of 1,169,522.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for April was 764,039, an increase of 4,036 over the March figure of 760,003.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 112 from the March figure of 1,335 to the April figure of 1,447.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 5,166 from the March figure of 302,690 to the April figure of 307,856.

The Department of the Air Force civilian personnel within the United States increased 1,914 from the March figure of 135,570 to the April figure of 137,484.

The Department of the Navy civilian personnel within the United States decreased 3,156 from the March figure of 320,408 to the April figure of 317,252.

Outside continental United States

(See table III)

Outside continental United States Federal personnel decreased 2,385 from the March total of 191,534 to the April total of 189,149.

An increase of 424 was reported by the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment, from the March total of 56,075 to the April total of 56,499.

Total civilian employment outside continental United States for the National Military Establishment decreased 2,809 from the March figure of 135,459 to the April figure of 132,650.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease in overseas civilian employment of 1,606 from the March figure of 68,213 to the April figure of 66,607.

The Department of the Air Force reported an increase in overseas civilian employment of 259 from the March figure of 27,127 to the April figure of 27,386.

The Department of the Navy reported a decrease in overseas civilian employment of 1,462 from the March figure of 40,119 to the April figure of 38,657.

Industrial employment

(See table IV)

Total industrial employment during the month of April increased 663 from the March total of 573,115 to the April total of 573,778.

The departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment increased 148 from the March total of 19,069 to the April total of 19,217.

The National Military Establishment increased its total industrial employment 515 from the March total of 554,046 to the April total of 554,561.

The Department of the Army reported a net increase of 3,034 from the March figure of 207,642 to the April figure of 210,676. Inside continental United States Army industrial employment increased 4,493, while outside continental United States there was a decrease of 1,459.

The Department of the Air Force reported an increase of 1,644 industrial employees from the March figure of 97,674 to the April figure of 99,318. Of this net increase in Air Force industrial employment 1,366 was inside continental United States and 278 was outside continental United States.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 4,163 from the March figure of 248,730 to the April figure of 244,567.

The term "industrial employees," as used by the committee, refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects, such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

Table V, carried at the end of this report, shows the trend in civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Govern-

ment, December 1947 (the month of postwar minimum employment) through April 1949, broken down as between total employment, net paid employment, and employment without compensation, by months and agencies.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has always included individuals reported by the various agencies as being employed in expert-consultant capacities even though they are classified as serving without compensation. These individuals have been counted as employees in view of the fact that many of them require full- and part-time assistants, office space, the privilege of using penalty mail, travel expenses, etc. In this chart the total figures for each agency include such individuals. The total listed in the paid-employment columns exclude such individuals, and the number of such individuals is shown by agency in the W. O. C. column. There are other without-compensation employees who are not classified as expert consultants who are not shown in this table who are not counted in any of the regular reports by the committee.

The second part of this table shows that portion of the total Federal employment in the executive branch reported by the three agencies with largest employment, the National Military Establishment, the Post Office Department, and the Veterans' Administration.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1949, and comparison with March 1949; and pay for March 1949 and comparison with February 1949*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	February	March	Increase	Decrease	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	$17,974	$20,511	$2,537		75,290	78,933	3,643	
Commerce	11,240	12,882	1,642		40,970	43,584	2,614	
Interior	12,478	13,995	1,517		50,109	51,860	1,751	
Justice	8,622	9,419	797		26,140	26,030		110
Labor	1,060	1,200	140		3,588	3,552		36
Post Office	120,505	124,948	4,443		508,925	512,207	3,282	
State	5,184	5,650	466		20,439	20,559	120	
Treasury	25,203	29,140	3,937		92,619	92,137		482
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	89	87		$2	229	230	1	
Bureau of the Budget	233	269	36		529	528		1
Executive Mansion and Grounds	13	15	2		61	65	4	
National Security Council [1]	7	7			18	18		
National Security Resources Board	160	169	9		373	373		
Council of Economic Advisers	20	23	3		40	40		
Emergency war agencies:								
Office of Defense Transportation	8	12	4		39	28		11
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	54	64	10		213	232	19	
Economic Cooperation Administration	953	977	24		3,395	3,460	65	
Office of the Housing Expediter	1,395	1,688	293		4,821	4,802		19
Philippine Alien Property Administration	[2] 29	37	8		125	122		3
Philippine War Damage Commission	188	212	24		952	959	7	
War Assets Administration	3,235	1,903		1,332	4,706	3,845		861
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	16	17	1		149	160	11	
Atomic Energy Commission	1,546	1,769	223		4,699	4,628		71
Civil Aeronautics Board	236	278	42		684	679		5
Civil Service Commission	1,135	1,303	168		4,245	4,177		68
Export-Import Bank of Washington	53	60	7		120	122	2	
Federal Communications Commission	459	529	70		1,350	1,349		1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	355	407	52		1,085	1,066		19
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	158	201	43		368	365		3
Federal Power Commission	293	331	38		808	797		11
Federal Security Agency [3]	8,598	9,876	1,278		35,718	35,971	253	
Federal Trade Commission	298	280		18	656	655		1
Federal Works Agency	5,298	6,061	$763		23,230	23,356	126	
General Accounting Office	2,641	3,041	400		9,460	9,433		27
Government Printing Office	2,202	2,568	366		7,032	7,039	7	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	[2] 3,582	3,476		106	11,763	11,579		184
Indian Claims Commission	6	7	1		11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	780	868	88		2,212	2,211		1
Maritime Commission	1,730	1,917	187		6,531	6,459		72
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	1,968	2,275	307		6,881	6,857		24
National Archives	110	127	17		389	382		7
National Capital Housing Authority	71	83	12		309	306		3
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	7	8	1		17	19	2	
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	1	1			2	2		
National Gallery of Art	74	74			319	315		4
National Labor Relations Board	484	556	72		1,517	1,519	2	
National Mediation Board	46	62	16		113	111		2
Panama Canal	3,224	4,079	855		22,761	22,666		95
Railroad Retirement Board	627	730	103		2,497	2,423		74
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,674	1,909	235		4,577	4,598	21	
Securities and Exchange Commission	429	496	67		1,152	1,147		5
Selective Service System	853	1,141	288		5,755	5,614		141
Smithsonian Institution	152	173	21		550	543		7
Tariff Commission	94	108	14		241	240		1
Tax Court of the United States	53	53			122	123	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	3,729	4,125	396		13,208	12,672		536
Veterans' Administration	47,939	53,945	6,006		211,683	212,863	1,180	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	229,571	326,142	28,029	1,458	1,215,795	1,226,021	13,111	2,885
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			26,571				10,226	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	439	535	96		1,335	1,447	112	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	71,031	80,286	9,255		302,690	307,856	5,166	
Outside continental United States	12,063	14,446	2,383		68,213	66,607		1,606
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	31,917	37,906	5,989		135,570	137,484	1,914	
Outside continental United States	5,066	6,136	1,070		27,127	27,386	259	
Department of the Navy	89,241	100,455	11,214		360,527	355,909		4,618
Total, National Military Establishment	209,757	239,764	30,007		895,462	896,689	7,451	6,224
Net increase, National Military Establishment							1,227	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	509,328	565,906	58,036	1,458	2,111,257	2,122,710	20,562	9,109
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			56,578				11,453	

[1] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Revised on the basis of later information.
[3] Includes personnel and pay for Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1949 and comparison with March 1949*

Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	73,185	76,685	3,500	
Commerce	37,900	40,464	2,564	
Interior	44,366	45,969	1,603	
Justice	25,663	25,551		112
Labor	3,552	3,516		36
Post Office	507,164	510,425	3,261	
State	7,871	7,962	91	
Treasury	91,925	91,443		482
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	229	230	1	
Bureau of the Budget	529	528		1
Executive Mansion and Grounds	61	65	4	
National Security Council [1]	18	18		
National Security Resources Board	373	373		
Council of Economic Advisers	40	40		
Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation	39	28		11
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	69	73	4	
Economic Cooperation Administration	931	935	4	
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,795	4,775		20
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2		
Philippine War Damage Commission	6	8	2	
War Assets Administration	4,703	3,843		860
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	10	13	3	
Atomic Energy Commission	4,695	4,624		71
Civil Aeronautics Board	664	660		4
Civil Service Commission	4,240	4,172		68
Export-Import Bank of Washington	118	120	2	
Federal Communication Commission	1,315	1,316	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,085	1,066		19
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	368	365		3
Federal Power Commission	808	797		11
Federal Security Agency [2]	34,715	34,965	250	
Federal Trade Commission	656	655		1
Federal Works Agency	22,546	22,645	99	
General Accounting Office	9,460	9,433		27
Government Printing Office	7,032	7,039	7	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,720	11,540		180
Indian Claims Commission	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,212	2,211		1
Independent agencies—Continued				
Maritime Commission	6,492	6,424		68
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,881	6,857		24
National Archives	389	382		7
National Capital Housing Authority	309	306		3
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	19	2	
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	2	2		
National Gallery of Art	319	315		4
National Labor Relations Board	1,506	1,508	2	
National Mediation Board	113	111		2
Panama Canal	643	640		3
Railroad Retirement Board	2,497	2,423		74
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,566	4,587	21	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,152	1,147		5
Selective Service System	5,589	5,451		138
Smithsonian Institution	545	538		7
Tariff Commission	241	240		1
Tax Court of the United States	122	123	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,208	12,672		536
Veterans' Administration	210,053	211,212	1,159	
Total, exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,159,720	1,169,522	12,581	2,779
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			9,802	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,335	1,447	112	
Department of the Army	302,690	307,856	5,166	
Department of the Air Force	135,570	137,484	1,914	
Department of the Navy	320,408	317,252		3,156
Total, National Military Establishment	760,003	764,039	7,192	3,156
Net increase, National Military Establishment			4,036	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	1,919,723	1,933,561	19,773	5,935
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			13,838	

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[2] Includes employees of Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1949, and comparison with March 1949*

Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	2,105	2,248	143	
Commerce	3,070	3,120	50	
Interior	5,743	5,891	148	
Justice	477	479	2	
Labor	36	36		
Post Office	1,761	1,782	21	
State	12,568	12,597	29	
Treasury	694	694		
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	144	159	15	
Economic Cooperation Administration	2,464	2,525	61	
Office of the Housing Expediter	26	27	1	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	123	120		3
Philippine War Damage Commission	946	951	5	
War Assets Administration	3	2		1
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	139	147	8	
Atomic Energy Commission	4	4		
Civil Aeronautics Board	20	19		1
Civil Service Commission	5	5		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2		
Federal Communications Commission	35	33		2
Federal Security Agency	1,003	1,006	3	
Federal Works Agency	684	711	27	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	43	39		4
Independent agencies—Continued				
Maritime Commission	39	35		4
National Labor Relations Board	11	11		
Panama Canal	22,118	22,026		92
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	11	11		
Selective Service System	166	163		3
Smithsonian Institution	5	5		
Veterans' Administration	1,630	1,651	21	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	56,075	56,499	534	110
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			424	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army	68,213	66,607		1,606
Department of the Air Force	27,127	27,386	259	
Department of the Navy	40,119	38,657		1,462
Total, National Military Establishment	135,459	132,650	259	3,068
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			2,809	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	191,534	189,149	793	3,178
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			2,385	

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1949, and comparison with March 1949*

Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Commerce	1,119	1,250	131	
Interior	4,352	4,876	524	
State	355	351		4
Treasury	4,415	4,420	5	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	148	118		30
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2	1		1
Panama Canal	1,827	1,851	24	
Tennessee Valley Authority	6,851	6,350		501
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	19,069	19,217	684	536
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			148	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	161,816	166,309	4,493	
Outside continental United States	45,826	44,367		1,459
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	77,302	78,668	1,366	
Outside continental United States	20,372	20,650	278	
Department of the Navy	248,730	244,567		4,163
Total, National Military Establishment	554,046	554,561	6,137	5,622
Net increase, National Military Establishment			515	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	573,115	573,778	6,821	6,158
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			663	

TABLE V.—*Trend in civilian employment in the executive agencies of the Federal Government, December 1947 (the month of postwar minimum employment) through April 1949*

SHOWING TOTAL EMPLOYMENT, NET PAID EMPLOYMENT, AND EMPLOYMENT WITHOUT COMPENSATION,[1] BY MONTHS AND AGENCIES

Name	Employment in December 1947			Employment in January 1948			Employment in February 1948			Employment in March 1948			Employment in April 1948			Employment in May 1948		
	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS																		
Agriculture	70,660	67,851	2,809	70,152	67,359	2,793	70,144	67,336	2,808	71,641	68,826	2,815	75,351	72,517	2,834	79,235	76,335	2,900
Commerce	37,036	36,964	72	37,371	37,302	69	38,194	38,124	70	39,289	39,218	71	40,146	40,080	66	40,370	40,307	63
Interior	46,195	46,039	156	46,810	46,651	159	47,214	47,028	186	47,900	47,747	153	49,776	49,592	184	51,690	51,550	140
Justice	25,238	25,147	136	25,899	25,889	10	26,175	26,164	11	26,453	26,442	11	26,270	26,259	11	26,272	26,267	5
Labor	4,577	4,544	33	4,546	4,513	33	4,556	4,522	34	4,662	4,622	40	4,578	4,534	44	4,532	4,488	44
Post Office	465,272	465,272	------	465,048	465,048	------	471,868	471,808	------	481,612	481,612	------	488,059	488,059	------	490,596	490,596	------
State	20,841	20,797	44	20,854	20,796	58	21,470	21,402	68	21,368	21,299	69	21,876	21,798	78	21,890	21,809	81
Treasury	85,079	84,873	206	85,306	85,101	205	87,839	87,637	202	89,605	89,403	202	90,117	89,917	200	89,644	89,447	197
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT																		
White House Office	223	219	4	222	218	4	220	216	4	223	219	4	222	218	4	221	217	4
Bureau of the Budget	602	598	4	601	597	4	603	600	3	605	602	3	612	609	3	593	590	3
Executive Mansion and Grounds	114	114	------	110	110	------	102	102	------	78	78	------	91	91	------	96	96	------
National Security Council	8	8	------	10	10	------	11	11	------	14	14	------	18	18	------	19	19	------
National Security Resources Board	65	64	1	73	71	2	84	81	3	107	101	6	150	129	21	176	155	21
Council of Economic Advisers	61	46	15	58	44	14	54	46	8	43	43	------	44	44	------	45	45	------
Office of Government Reports	19	19	------	19	19	------	18	18	------	18	18	------	18	18	------	17	17	------
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES																		
Office of Defense Transportation	41	37	4	42	37	5	41	36	5	44	39	5	47	41	6	50	43	7
Office of Scientific Research and Development	14	14	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
POSTWAR AGENCIES																		
Displaced Persons Commission	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Economic Cooperation Administration	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	113	113	------	273	273	------
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,672	4,670	2	4,635	4,633	2	4,635	4,633	2	4,509	4,507	2	4,554	4,552	2	4,591	4,591	------
Philippine Alien Property Administration	170	170	------	171	171	------	171	171	------	165	165	------	159	159	------	134	134	------
Philippine War Damage Commission	550	550	------	574	574	------	571	571	------	692	692	------	784	784	------	830	830	------
War Assets Administration	30,338	30,338	------	29,588	29,588	------	29,285	29,285	------	25,700	25,700	------	24,163	24,163	------	22,663	22,663	------
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES																		
American Battle Monuments Commission	101	101	------	102	102	------	103	103	------	118	118	------	114	114	------	117	117	------
Atomic Energy Commission	4,763	4,757	6	4,879	4,868	11	4,947	4,935	12	4,955	4,943	12	4,990	4,978	12	5,031	5,019	12
Civil Aeronautics Board	579	579	------	584	584	------	588	588	------	595	595	------	598	598	------	622	622	------
Civil Service Commission	3,747	3,686	61	3,878	3,817	61	4,012	3,951	61	4,097	4,026	71	4,096	4,028	68	4,125	4,054	71
Export-Import Bank of Washington	113	113	------	113	113	------	114	114	------	115	115	------	118	118	------	123	123	------
Federal Communications Commission	1,322	1,322	------	1,342	1,342	------	1,359	1,359	------	1,359	1,359	------	1,361	1,361	------	1,366	1,366	------
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,159	1,157	2	1,147	1,145	2	1,151	1,149	2	1,132	1,130	2	1,122	1,120	2	1,114	1,112	2
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	373	373	------	368	368	------	367	367	------	374	373	1	369	369	------	378	378	------
Federal Power Commission	781	781	------	795	795	------	793	793	------	804	804	------	803	803	------	792	792	------
Federal Security Agency	33,689	33,689	------	34,128	34,128	------	34,219	34,219	------	34,418	34,418	------	34,660	34,660	------	34,633	34,633	------
Federal Trade Commission	562	562	------	561	561	------	559	559	------	558	558	------	557	557	------	554	554	------
Federal Works Agency	22,845	22,821	24	22,683	22,659	24	22,577	22,553	24	22,520	22,496	24	22,302	22,278	24	22,409	22,385	24
General Accounting Office	9,448	9,448	------	9,377	9,377	------	9,353	9,353	------	9,302	9,302	------	9,262	9,262	------	9,232	9,232	------
Government Printing Office	7,544	7,544	------	7,485	7,485	------	7,398	7,398	------	7,312	7,312	------	7,223	7,223	------	7,114	7,114	------

[1] The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has always included individuals reported by the various agencies as being employed in expert-consultant capacities even though they are classified as serving without compensation. These individuals have been counted as employees in view of the fact that many of them require full- and part-time assistants, office space, the privilege of using penalty mail, travel expenses, etc. In this chart the total figures shown for each agency include such individuals. The totals listed in the paid employment column exclude such individuals, and the number of such individuals is shown by agency in the WOC column. There are other without-compensation employees who are not classified as expert consultants who are not shown in this table and who are not counted in any of the regular reports by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

TABLE V.—*Trend in civilian employment in the executive agencies of the Federal Government, December 1947 (the month of postwar minimum employment) through April 1949*—Continued

Name	Employment in December 1947			Employment in January 1948			Employment in February 1948			Employment in March 1948			Employment in April 1948			Employment in May 1948		
	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—con.																		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,086	12,077	9	11,953	11,946	7	11,825	11,817	8	11,807	11,799	8	11,723	11,716	7	11,753	11,746	7
Indian Claims Commission	12	12	------	11	11	------	11	11	------	11	11	------	11	11	------	11	11	------
Interstste Commerce Commission	2,257	2,257	------	2,263	2,263	------	2,257	2,257	------	2,265	2,265	------	2,250	2,250	------	2,292	2,292	------
Maritime Commission	6,861	6,844	17	6,921	6,903	18	6,948	6,931	17	7,104	7,087	17	7,261	7,252	9	7,424	7,413	11
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,076	6,061	15	6,172	6,157	15	6,249	6,234	15	6,235	6,220	15	6,204	6,189	15	6,169	6,154	15
National Archives	328	328	------	330	330	------	335	335	------	345	345	------	344	344	------	344	344	------
National Capital Housing Authority	286	286	------	290	290	------	284	284	------	292	292	------	288	288	------	286	286	------
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	24	24	------	25	25	------	24	24	------	24	24	------	23	23	------	21	21	------
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
National Gallery of Art	311	311	------	318	318	------	317	317	------	311	311	------	319	319	------	317	317	------
National Labor Relations Board	880	880	------	961	961	------	1,135	1,135	------	1,371	1,371	------	1,610	1,610	------	1,788	1,788	------
National Mediation Board	103	103	------	113	113	------	108	108	------	116	116	------	115	115	------	111	111	------
Panama Canal	24,263	24,263	------	24,857	24,857	------	24,732	24,732	------	24,512	24,512	------	24,255	24,255	------	24,002	24,002	------
Railroad Retirement Board	2,783	2,783	------	2,796	2,796	------	2,769	2,769	------	2,759	2,759	------	2,755	2,755	------	2,656	2,656	------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	6,270	6,270	------	6,053	6,053	------	5,883	5,883	------	5,765	5,765	------	5,634	5,634	------	5,567	5,567	------
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,180	1,180	------	1,086	1,086	------	1,123	1,123	------	1,122	1,122	------	1,111	1,111	------	1,123	1,123	------
Selective Service System	667	667	------	663	663	------	680	680	------	706	706	------	720	720	------	737	737	------
Smithsonian Institution	520	519	1	514	513	1	519	518	1	512	511	1	510	509	1	514	513	1
Tariff Commission	222	222	------	224	224	------	223	223	------	219	219	------	221	221	------	218	218	------
Tax Court of the United States	124	124	------	126	126	------	125	125	------	125	125	------	126	126	------	126	126	------
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,222	14,222	------	14,144	14,144	------	14,111	14,111	------	14,326	14,326	------	14,697	14,697	------	15,054	15,054	------
Veterans' Administration	207,840	201,448	6,392	208,084	201,583	6,501	206,626	199,862	6,764	202,603	195,506	7,097	201,910	194,170	7,740	202,183	193,737	8,446
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,166,161	1,156,148	10,013	1,167,435	1,157,437	9,998	1,177,079	1,166,771	10,308	1,184,917	1,174,288	10,629	1,196,810	1,185,479	11,331	1,204,243	1,192,189	12,054
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT																		
Office of the Secretary of Defense	636	632	4	598	592	6	675	667	8	751	741	10	827	812	15	875	855	20
Department of the Army	349,295	349,249	46	353,168	353,125	43	352,889	352,848	41	359,403	359,376	27	363,936	363,904	32	367,698	367,635	63
Department of the Air Force	140,080	140,080	------	141,037	141,037	------	143,036	143,036	------	145,911	145,911	------	147,951	147,951	------	150,190	150,190	------
Department of the Navy	339,268	339,207	61	339,620	339,558	62	340,131	340,083	48	339,907	339,863	44	340,929	340,882	47	343,355	343,308	47
Total, National Military Establishment	829,279	829,168	111	834,423	834,312	111	836,731	836,634	97	845,972	845,891	81	853,643	853,549	94	862,118	861,988	130
Total	1,995,440	1,985,316	10,124	2,001,858	1,991,749	10,109	2,013,810	2,003,405	10,405	2,030,889	2,020,179	10,710	2,050,453	2,039,028	11,425	2,066,361	2,054,177	12,184

Name	Employment in June 1948			Employment in July 1948			Employment in August 1948			Employment in September 1948			Employment in October 1948			Employment in November 1948		
	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS																		
Agriculture	85,103	82,134	2,969	86,749	83,756	2,993	84,839	81,763	3,076	81,027	77,970	3,057	79,399	76,313	3,086	76,767	73,639	3,128
Commerce	40,935	40,872	63	40,523	40,464	59	40,729	40,670	59	40,577	40,510	67	40,382	40,314	68	40,381	40,313	68
Interior	56,338	56,193	145	57,218	57,073	145	55,918	55,774	144	52,380	52,240	140	50,736	50,601	135	50,447	50,305	142
Justice	26,288	26,277	11	26,244	26,233	11	26,026	26,015	11	25,891	25,880	11	26,015	26,004	11	26,279	26,267	12
Labor	4,514	4,467	47	3,556	3,508	48	3,425	3,377	48	3,470	3,420	50	3,382	3,334	48	3,481	3,431	50
Post Office	498,415	498,415	------	508,834	508,834	------	514,020	514,020	------	517,482	517,482	------	492,090	492,090	------	501,854	501,854	------
State	21,919	21,835	84	20,737	20,656	81	20,249	20,167	82	20,029	19,951	78	19,857	19,780	77	19,932	19,855	77
Treasury	89,386	89,188	198	87,395	87,197	198	87,333	87,134	199	87,603	87,404	199	88,412	88,214	198	88,714	88,516	198

TABLE V.—*Trend in civilian employment in the executive agencies of the Federal Government, December 1947 (the month of postwar minimum employment) through April 1949*—Continued

Name	Employment in June 1948			Employment in July 1948			Employment in August 1948			Employment in September 1948			Employment in October 1948			Employment in November 1948		
	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT																		
White House Office	214	210	4	218	212	6	219	214	5	218	212	6	218	212	6	218	212	6
Bureau of the Budget	582	579	3	536	534	2	512	510	2	521	519	2	530	528	2	537	535	2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	60	60	------	92	92	------	66	66	------	63	63	------	85	85	------	64	64	------
National Security Council	22	22	------	21	21	------	21	21	------	21	21	------	22	22	------	19	19	------
National Security Resources Board	232	208	24	265	239	26	288	261	27	322	294	28	326	294	32	378	341	37
Council of Economic Advisers	44	44	------	42	42	------	42	42	------	39	39	------	39	39	------	39	39	------
Office of Government Reports	17	17	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES																		
Office of Defense Transportation	54	45	9	52	43	9	51	51	9	47	38	9	41	32	9	40	31	9
Office of Scientific Research and Development	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
POSTWAR AGENCIES																		
Displaced Persons Commission	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	34	34	------	74	74	------	106	106	------
Economic Cooperation Administration	571	571	------	954	954	------	2,042	2,042	------	1,995	1,995	------	2,458	2,458	------	2,491	2,491	------
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,568	4,568	------	4,618	4,618	------	4,679	4,679	------	4,726	4,726	------	4,760	4,760	------	4,810	4,810	------
Philippine Alien Property Administration	142	142	------	141	141	------	139	139	------	138	138	------	139	139	------	137	137	------
Philippine War Damage Commission	908	908	------	928	928	------	926	926	------	925	925	------	934	934	------	936	936	------
War Assets Administration	17,129	17,129	------	15,981	15,981	------	14,165	14,165	------	11,754	11,754	------	11,014	11,014	------	10,241	10,241	------
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES																		
American Battle Monuments Commission	121	121	------	132	132	------	133	133	------	134	134	------	138	138	------	138	138	------
Atomic Energy Commission	5,030	5,018	12	5,064	5,051	13	5,058	5,045	13	5,041	5,027	14	4,964	4,956	8	4,890	4,882	8
Civil Aeronautics Board	632	632	------	625	625	------	634	634	------	653	653	------	663	663	------	666	666	------
Civil Service Commission	4,106	4,043	63	4,152	4,095	57	4,116	4,067	49	4,099	4,052	47	4,101	4,055	46	4,109	4,062	47
Export-Import Bank of Washington	125	125	------	128	128	------	131	131	------	127	127	------	128	128	------	125	125	------
Federal Communications Commission	1,380	1,380	------	1,385	1,385	------	1,373	1,373	------	1,362	1,362	------	1,364	1,364	------	1,360	1,360	------
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,095	1,093	2	1,001	999	2	1,001	999	2	1,022	1,020	2	1,023	1,021	2	1,025	1,023	2
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	383	383	------	376	376	------	380	380	------	372	372	------	381	381	------	379	379	------
Federal Power Commission	809	809	------	825	825	------	828	828	------	827	827	------	828	828	------	829	829	------
Federal Security Agency	34,552	34,552	------	35,184	35,184	------	34,926	34,926	------	34,998	34,998	------	34,812	34,812	------	35,048	35,048	------
Federal Trade Commission	574	574	------	594	594	------	615	615	------	623	623	------	626	626	------	636	636	------
Federal Works Agency	22,565	22,541	24	22,798	22,774	24	23,090	23,066	24	23,049	23,025	24	23,002	22,978	24	22,924	22,900	24
General Accounting Office	9,170	9,170	------	9,177	9,177	------	9,191	9,191	------	9,229	9,229	------	9,368	9,368	------	9,443	9,443	------
Government Printing Office	7,074	7,074	------	7,034	7,034	------	7,041	7,041	------	7,024	7,024	------	6,980	6,980	------	6,986	6,986	------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,734	11,727	7	11,690	11,683	7	11,637	11,630	7	11,683	11,676	7	11,652	11,645	7	11,780	11,773	7
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	------	11	11	------	11	11	------	11	11	------	11	11	------	11	11	------
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,301	2,301	------	2,290	2,290	------	2,277	2,277	------	2,266	2,266	------	2,287	2,287	------	2,297	2,297	------
Maritime Commission	7,219	7,208	11	6,706	6,695	11	6,603	6,594	9	6,717	6,706	11	6,809	6,798	11	6,773	6,763	10
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,279	6,264	15	6,670	6,653	17	6,687	6,670	17	6,670	6,653	17	6,700	6,683	17	6,780	6,763	17
National Archives	341	341	------	350	350	------	354	354	------	364	364	------	365	365	------	371	371	------
National Capital Housing Authority	282	282	------	290	290	------	290	290	------	297	297	------	302	302	------	306	306	------
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	20	------	19	19	------	20	20	------	22	22	------	21	21	------	20	20	------

TABLE V.—*Trend in civilian employment in the executive agencies of the Federal Government, December 1947 (the month of postwar minimum employment) through April 1949*—Continued

Name	Employment in June 1948			Employment in July 1948			Employment in August 1948			Employment in September 1948			Employment in October 1948			Employment in November 1948		
	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—con.																		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	------	------	------	------	------	------	3	3	------	3	3	------	3	3	------	3	3	------
National Gallery of Art	322	322	------	321	321	------	321	321	------	317	317	------	319	319	------	319	319	------
National Labor Relations Board	1,992	1,992	------	2,107	2,107	------	1,953	1,953	------	1,911	1,911	------	1,833	1,833	------	1,827	1,827	------
National Mediation Board	109	109	------	106	106	------	98	98	------	103	103	------	102	102	------	104	104	------
Panama Canal	23,477	23,477	------	22,647	22,647	------	23,042	23,042	------	22,956	22,956	------	23,340	23,340	------	23,051	23,051	------
Railroad Retirement Board	2,599	2,599	------	2,545	2,545	------	2,492	2,492	------	2,443	2,443	------	2,391	2,391	------	2,401	2,401	------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,382	5,382	------	5,184	5,184	------	5,017	5,017	------	4,891	4,891	------	4,801	4,801	------	4,801	4,801	------
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,149	1,149	------	1,148	1,148	------	1,151	1,151	------	1,153	1,153	------	1,161	1,161	------	1,159	1,159	------
Selective Service System	758	758	------	772	772	------	3,508	3,508	------	5,122	5,122	------	5,725	5,725	------	5,933	5,933	------
Smithsonian Institution	517	516	1	536	535	1	556	555	1	555	554	1	554	553	1	561	560	1
Tariff Commission	219	219	------	227	227	------	234	234	------	241	241	------	240	240	------	241	241	------
Tax Court of the United States	126	126	------	125	125	------	125	125	------	124	124	------	124	124	------	124	124	------
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,223	15,223	------	15,110	15,110	------	15,148	15,148	------	14,657	14,657	------	14,352	14,352	------	14,307	14,307	------
Veterans' Administration	205,451	196,858	8,593	207,179	198,561	8,618	209,883	201,233	8,650	210,236	200,884	9,352	212,682	202,090	10,592	214,585	203,488	11,097
Total excluding National Military Establishment	1,220,568	1,208,283	12,285	1,229,612	1,217,284	12,328	1,235,625	1,223,191	12,434	1,230,564	1,217,442	13,122	1,205,065	1,190,685	14,380	1,214,183	1,199,241	14,942
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT																		
Office of the Secretary of Defense	984	963	21	995	974	21	1,019	997	22	1,054	1,032	22	1,104	1,077	27	1,132	1,096	36
Department of the Army	370,716	370,684	32	370,946	370,922	24	373,685	373,654	31	368,466	368,439	27	368,490	368,459	31	369,047	369,016	31
Department of the Air Force	152,391	152,391	------	153,798	153,798	------	154,131	154,131	------	154,962	154,962	------	155,752	155,752	------	156,679	156,679	------
Department of the Navy	347,687	347,651	36	351,911	351,874	37	356,442	356,408	34	359,976	359,938	38	361,815	361,777	38	363,588	363,549	39
Total, National Military Establishment	871,778	871,689	89	877,650	877,568	82	885,277	885,190	87	884,458	884,371	87	887,161	887,065	96	890,446	890,340	106
Total	2,092,346	2,079,972	12,374	2,107,262	2,094,852	12,410	2,120,902	2,108,381	12,521	2,115,022	2,101,813	13,209	2,092,226	2,077,750	14,476	2,104,629	2,089,581	15,048

Name	Employment in December 1948			Employment in January 1949			Employment in February 1949			Employment in March 1949			Employment in April 1949		
	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS															
Agriculture	74,963	71,842	3,121	73,680	70,565	3,115	73,940	70,893	3,047	75,290	72,161	3,129	78,933	75,762	3,171
Commerce	40,139	40,073	66	39,926	39,859	67	40,240	40,174	66	40,970	40,903	67	43,584	43,517	67
Interior	49,484	49,342	112	49,588	49,441	147	49,901	49,755	146	50,109	49,958	151	51,860	51,734	126
Justice	26,195	26,183	12	26,345	26,333	12	26,186	26,174	12	26,140	26,128	12	26,030	26,017	13
Labor	3,507	3,458	49	3,521	3,472	49	3,399	3,350	49	3,588	3,537	51	3,552	3,499	53
Post Office	508,321	508,321	------	507,507	507,507	------	507,430	507,430	------	508,925	508,925	------	512,207	512,207	------
State	20,001	19,923	78	20,115	20,027	88	20,210	20,137	73	20,439	20,371	68	20,559	20,488	71
Treasury	88,567	88,369	198	89,015	88,819	196	91,302	91,108	194	92,619	92,425	194	92,137	91,944	193
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT															
White House Office	214	209	5	218	213	5	225	220	5	229	224	5	230	225	5
Bureau of the Budget	538	536	2	530	528	2	531	529	2	529	527	2	528	526	2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	64	64	------	69	69	------	60	60	------	61	61	------	65	65	------
National Security Council	19	19	------	22	22	------	22	22	------	18	18	------	18	18	------
National Security Resources Board	390	350	40	410	366	44	407	362	45	373	327	46	373	325	48
Council of Economic Advisers	39	39	------	39	39	------	39	39	------	40	40	------	40	40	------
Office of Government Reports	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES															
Office of Defense Transportation	40	31	9	39	35	4	39	30	9	39	30	9	28	19	9
Office of Scientific Research and Development	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
POSTWAR AGENCIES															
Displaced Persons Commission	116	116	------	147	147	------	179	179	------	213	213	------	232	232	------
Economic Cooperation Administration	2,852	2,852	------	3,078	3,078	------	3,078	3,078	------	3,395	3,395	------	3,460	3,460	------
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,837	4,837	------	4,856	4,856	------	4,884	4,884	------	4,821	4,821	------	4,802	4,802	------
Philippine Alien Property Administration	134	134	------	128	128	------	127	127	------	125	125	------	122	122	------
Philippine War Damage Commission	937	937	------	933	933	------	943	943	------	952	952	------	959	959	------
War Assets Administration	7,349	7,349	------	6,708	6,708	------	4,899	4,899	------	4,706	4,706	------	3,845	3,845	------

TABLE V.—*Trend in civilian employment in the executive agencies of the Federal Government, December 1947 (the month of postwar minimum employment) through April 1949*—Continued

Name	Employment in December 1948			Employment in January 1949			Employment in February 1949			Employment in March 1949			Employment in April 1949		
	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES															
American Battle Monuments Commission	135	135	------	138	138	------	143	143	------	149	149	------	160	160	------
Atomic Energy Commission	4,835	4,827	8	4,803	4,795	8	4,811	4,806	5	4,699	4,694	5	4,628	4,624	4
Civil Aeronautics Board	664	664	------	670	670	------	682	682	------	684	684	------	679	679	------
Civil Service Commission	4,118	4,071	47	4,228	4,181	47	4,227	4,186	41	4,245	4,185	60	4,177	4,117	60
Export-Import Bank of Washington	123	123	------	122	122	------	121	121	------	120	120	------	122	122	------
Federal Communications Commission	1,354	1,354	------	1,353	1,353	------	1,349	1,349	------	1,350	1,350	------	1,349	1,349	------
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,031	1,029	2	1,052	1,050	2	1,062	1,060	2	1,085	1,083	2	1,066	1,064	2
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	377	377	------	374	374	------	368	368	------	368	368	------	365	365	------
Federal Power Commission	831	831	------	824	824	------	819	819	------	808	808	------	797	797	------
Federal Security Agency	34,972	34,972	------	35,114	35,114	------	35,267	35,267	------	35,718	35,718	------	35,971	35,971	------
Federal Trade Commission	634	634	------	650	650	------	662	662	------	656	656	------	655	655	------
Federal Works Agency	22,853	22,829	24	23,081	23,057	24	23,124	23,100	24	23,230	23,204	26	23,356	23,332	24
General Accounting Office	9,411	9,411	------	9,432	9,432	------	9,430	9,430	------	9,460	9,460	------	9,433	9,433	------
Government Printing Office	6,953	6,953	------	6,999	6,999	------	7,037	7,037	------	7,032	7,032	------	7,039	7,039	------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,678	11,671	7	11,862	11,855	7	11,873	11,866	7	11,763	11,756	7	11,579	11,572	7
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	------	11	11	------	11	11	------	11	11	------	11	11	------
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,286	2,286	------	2,248	2,248	------	2,228	2,228	------	2,212	2,212	------	2,211	2,211	------
Maritime Commission	6,530	6,521	9	6,571	6,559	12	6,631	6,619	12	6,531	6,519	12	6,459	6,447	12
National Advisory Committee for Aeronatics	6,887	6,870	17	6,895	6,878	17	6,904	6,887	17	6,881	6,864	17	6,857	6,840	17
National Archives	380	380	------	388	388	------	388	388	------	389	389	------	382	382	------
National Capital Housing Authority	306	306	------	308	308	------	305	305	------	309	309	------	306	306	------
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	20	------	18	18	------	18	18	------	17	17	------	19	19	------
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	3	3	------	3	3	------	3	3	------	2	2	------	2	2	------
National Gallery of Art	317	317	------	320	320	------	325	325	------	319	319	------	315	315	------
National Labor Relations Board	1,661	1,661	------	1,582	1,582	------	1,517	1,517	------	1,517	1,517	------	1,519	1,519	------
National Mediation Board	107	107	------	108	108	------	113	113	------	113	113	------	111	111	------
Panama Canal	22,918	22,918	------	22,920	22,920	------	22,804	22,804	------	22,761	22,761	------	22,666	22,666	------
Railroad Retirement Board	2,388	2,388	------	2,421	2,421	------	2,451	2,451	------	2,497	2,497	------	2,423	2,423	------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,623	4,623	------	4,578	4,578	------	4,589	4,589	------	4,577	4,577	------	4,598	4,598	------
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,159	1,159	------	1,165	1,165	------	1,163	1,163	------	1,152	1,152	------	1,147	1,147	------
Selective Service System	5,979	5,979	------	5,903	5,903	------	5,834	5,834	------	5,755	5,755	------	5,614	5,614	------
Smithsonian Institution	556	555	1	550	549	1	548	547	1	550	549	1	543	542	1
Tariff Commission	239	239	------	240	240	------	240	240	------	241	241	------	240	240	------
Tax Court of the United States	124	124	------	122	122	------	121	121	------	122	122	------	123	123	------
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,982	13,982	------	13,771	13,771	------	13,581	13,581	------	13,208	13,208	------	12,672	12,672	------
Veterans' Administration	215,078	203,404	11,674	212,928	202,489	10,439	211,453	200,625	10,828	211,683	200,142	11,541	212,863	200,650	12,213
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,214,229	1,198,718	15,511	1,210,626	1,196,340	14,286	1,210,243	1,195,658	14,585	1,215,795	1,200,390	15,405	1,226,021	1,209,923	16,098
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT															
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,190	1,159	31	1,226	1,194	32	1,295	1,263	32	1,335	1,303	32	1,447	1,415	32
Department of the Army	367,365	367,334	31	367,912	367,884	28	370,024	370,001	23	370,903	370,877	26	374,463	374,437	26
Department of the Air Force	157,799	157,799	------	158,789	158,789	------	160,232	160,232	------	162,697	162,697	------	164,870	164,870	------
Department of the Navy	363,874	363,835	39	364,285	364,256	29	363,186	363,159	27	360,527	360,499	28	355,909	355,880	29
Total, National Military Establishment	890,228	890,127	101	892,212	892,123	89	894,737	894,655	82	895,462	985,376	86	896,689	896,602	87
Total	2,104,457	2,088,845	15,612	2,102,838	2,088,463	14,375	2,104,980	2,090,313	14,667	2,111,257	2,095,766	15,491	2,122,710	2,106,525	16,185

Employment trends in the principal Federal employing agencies

BY AGENCIES AND MONTHS—DECEMBER 1947 (POSTWAR MINIMUM EMPLOYMENT) THROUGH APRIL 1949

Name	Employment in December 1947			Employment in January 1948			Employment in February 1948			Employment in March 1948			Employment in April 1948			Employment in May 1948		
	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC
Post Office Department	465,272	465,272	------	465,048	465,048	------	471,868	471,868	------	481,612	481,612	------	488,059	488,059	------	490,596	490,596	------
Veterans' Administration	207,840	201,448	6,392	208,084	201,583	6,501	206,626	199,862	6,764	202,603	195,506	7,097	201,910	194,170	7,740	202,183	193,737	8,446
National Military Establishment	829,279	829,168	111	834,423	834,312	111	836,731	836,634	97	845,972	845,891	81	853,643	853,549	94	862,118	861,988	130
Total	1,502,391	1,495,888	6,503	1,507,555	1,500,943	6,612	1,515,225	1,508,364	6,861	1,530,187	1,523,009	7,178	1,543,612	1,535,778	7,834	1,554,897	1,546,321	8,576
All other executive departments and agencies	493,049	489,428	3,621	494,303	490,806	3,497	498,585	495,041	3,544	500,702	497,170	3,532	506,841	503,250	3,591	511,464	507,856	3,608
Grand total	1,995,440	1,985,316	10,124	2,001,858	1,991,749	10,109	2,013,810	2,003,405	10,405	2,030,889	2,020,179	10,710	2,050,453	2,039,028	11,425	2,066,361	2,054,177	12,184

Name	Employment in June 1948			Employment in July 1948			Employment in August 1948			Employment in September 1948			Employment in October 1948			Employment in November 1948		
	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC
Post Office Department	498,415	498,415	------	508,834	508,834	------	514,020	514,020	------	517,482	517,482	------	492,090	492,090	------	501,854	501,854	------
Veterans' Administration	205,451	196,858	8,593	207,179	198,561	8,618	209,883	201,233	8,650	210,236	200,884	9,352	212,682	202,090	10,592	214,585	203,488	11,097
National Military Establishment	871,778	871,689	89	877,650	877,568	82	885,277	885,190	87	884,458	884,371	87	887,161	887,065	96	890,446	890,340	106
Total	1,575,644	1,566,962	8,682	1,593,663	1,584,963	8,700	1,609,180	1,600,443	8,737	1,612,176	1,602,737	9,439	1,591,933	1,581,245	10,688	1,606,885	1,595,682	11,203
All other executive departments and agencies	516,702	513,010	3,692	513,599	509,889	3,710	511,722	507,938	3,784	502,846	499,076	3,770	500,293	496,505	3,788	497,744	493,899	3,845
Grand total	2,092,346	2,079,972	12,374	2,107,262	2,094,852	12,410	2,120,902	2,108,381	12,521	2,115,022	2,101,813	13,209	2,092,226	2,077,750	14,476	2,104,629	2,089,581	15,048

Employment trends in the principal Federal employing agencies—Continued

Name	Employment in December 1948			Employment in January 1949			Employment in February 1949			Employment in March 1949			Employment in April 1949		
	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC	Total	Paid	WOC
Post Office Department	508,321	508,321	------	507,507	507,507	------	507,430	507,430	------	508,925	508,925	------	512,207	512,207	------
Veterans' Administration	215,078	203,404	11,674	212,928	202,489	10,439	211,453	200,625	10,828	211,683	200,142	11,541	212,863	200,650	12,213
National Military Establishment	890,228	890,127	101	892,212	892,123	89	894,737	894,655	82	895,462	895,376	86	896,689	896,602	87
Total	1,613,627	1,601,852	11,775	1,612,647	1,602,119	10,528	1,613,620	1,602,710	10,910	1,616,070	1,604,443	11,627	1,621,759	1,609,459	12,300
All other executive departments and agencies	490,830	486,993	3,837	490,191	486,344	3,847	491,360	487,603	3,757	495,187	491,323	3,864	500,951	497,066	3,885
Grand total	2,104,457	2,088,845	15,612	2,102,838	2,088,463	14,375	2,104,980	2,090,313	14,667	2,111,257	2,095,766	15,491	2,122,710	2,106,525	16,185

The statement presented by Mr. BYRD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY PEOPLE A DAY

The number of civilian employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government in April increased at the rate of more than 350 a day.

MILLION DOLLARS A DAY

Average Federal pay is approximately $3,000 a year. If those added to the Federal pay roll in April represent a net permanent increase, it means annual Federal personnel costs were increased during the month at the rate of more than a million dollars a day.

MORE THAN 2,000,000 ON ROLLS

Total civilian employment in the executive branch in April numbered 2,122,710. The total for March was 2,111,257. The increase for the month was 11,453.

These figures were revealed today in a compilation of personnel reports certified by 61 reporting agencies of the executive branch to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

INCREASE LEADERS

The greatest increase for the month was reported by the Department of Agriculture with 3,643. This was closely followed by the Army Department with an increase of 3,560 civilian employees. The Post Office Department was third with an increase of 3,282.

The largest decrease reported for the month was in the Department of the Navy, which had a reduction of 4,618. War Assets Administration, which is in liquidation, reported the second largest decrease with 861.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION INCREASE

While great publicity has been given the report that the Veterans' Administration was to reduce its employment by 8,000, the Administration certified to the committee that there was a net increase of 508 during April in its paid personnel. Previous reports by the Administration reveal that since the beginning of the current fiscal year there had been a net increase in its paid personnel of 3,792 for the 10-month period.

BIG PERSONNEL AGENCIES

A special table in the committee report for April shows that three agencies—the National Military Establishment, the Post Office Department, and the Veterans' Administration—are employing a total of nearly 1,600,000, approximately 76 percent of the total civilian personnel in the executive branch.

Employees reported by the remaining 55 principal departments and agencies aggregate little more than 500,000, or about 24 percent of the total.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. KERR, and Mr. CAIN):

S. 2116. A bill to provide for the advance planning of public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 2117. A bill to provide for the designation of the reservoir to be formed by the Davis Dam on the Colorado River, as Lake Mohave; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. MALONE also introduced Senate bill 2118, for the relief of Gracy Mariluch, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MALONE also introduced Senate bill 2119, for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MALONE also introduced Senate bill 2120, for the relief of Edwin A. Knous, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MALONE also introduced Senate bill 2121, for the relief of Mrs. Lucille (Swett) Brown, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2122. A bill to authorize the construction of the Klickitat unit on the Wapato project, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2123. A bill to amend section 6 of the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 525, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2124. A bill to extend indefinitely the period in which title I of the Agricultural Act of 1948 shall be applicable; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2125. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of J. N. Jones, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2126. A bill to prohibit the Government from furnishing stamped envelopes containing any lithographing, engraving, or printing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2127. A bill for the relief of Thomas Clayton Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2128. A bill to provide for the modification or cancellation of certain royalty-free licenses granted to the Government by private holders of patents and rights thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MALONE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 111, to appoint a board of engineers to examine and report upon the proposed central Arizona project, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

GRACY MARILUCH

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Gracy Mariluch, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the explanatory statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2118) for the relief of Gracy Mariluch, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause an immigration visa to be issued to Gracy Mariluch, of Paris, France, permitting her immediate entry into the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, other than those relating to quotas. Upon issuance of such visa, the Secretary shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Spain.

The statement presented by Mr. MALONE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE

Miss Gracy Mariluch, 24, who has lived in France since 40 days after her birth, had intended to accompany her mother, sister, and brother to the United States to make their home in Elko, Nev.

Her mother is a former resident of Nevada, and her brother was born in the United States and served in World War II.

Her mother is studying to prepare for application for citizenship.

The necessary papers had been prepared for the entire family to live in the United States under the French quota when it was discovered that Miss Gracy Mariluch would come under the Spanish quota, since she was born in Spain, while her parents were en route from the United States to France.

To await her admission under the Spanish quota would necessitate a separation of the family for nearly 10 years.

This bill was approved by the immigration authorities and the Attorney General's office and was favorably reported by the Senate

Judiciary Committee and passed by the Senate late in the regular 1948 session.

ALAMO IRRIGATION CO.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co., and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me and the report of the Judiciary Committee of last year be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the explanatory statement and the report of the Judiciary Committee of last year will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2119) for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co., introduced by Mr. MALONE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to credit the note for $46,200 executed by the Alamo Irrigation Co., of Alamo, Nev., and dated August 7, 1946, with the sum of $1,193.50, representing the interest accrued thereon from August 7, 1946, to June 17, 1947, during which time said corporation was prevented from applying the funds for which such note was given to the contemplated purpose of lining a canal, first by the impossibility of securing acceptable bids therefor during the fall months of 1946, and thereafter by the necessity of using the existing canal to transport irrigation water to farms until the 1947 crops were matured.

The explanatory statement by Senator MALONE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE

The Alamo Irrigation Co. is asking for a waiver of interest on a loan made to them by the Farmers Home Administration on August 7, 1947, for the purpose of building an irrigation canal. They were prevented from applying for the funds granted under this loan, first, because of the impossibility of securing acceptable bids during the fall of 1936, and thereafter by the necessity of using the existing canal to transport irrigation water to farms until the 1947 crops were matured.

They feel they were not actually entitled to use the funds until June 10, 1947, when a representative of the FHA and the board of directors of the company met and approved the type of lining to be used in construction of the canal.

The interest which would be waived under this bill is for the period August 7, 1946, to June 17, 1947, and amounts to $1,193.50.

The amount of the loan, $46,200, was deposited in a joint account, on August 7, 1946. No funds could be drawn against the account without both the signature of an officer of the Alamo Irrigation Co. and a supervisor appointed by the FHA.

The first withdrawal was made June 17, 1947, in the amount of $165.

None of the money was used for any purpose during the period for which the refund of interest is claimed, August 7, 1946, to June 17, 1947.

The matter has been discussed with Mr. R. W. Hollenberg, State director of the FHA in Nevada and California, who directly handled the case, who says the FHA would like to waive the interest, but that it must be done by means of a bill in Congress.

This bill was cleared by the Attorney General's office, favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee, and passed the Senate as amended late in the regular 1948 session of Congress.

The report of the Committee on the Judiciary is as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2049), for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co., having considered the same, do now report the bill to the Senate favorably, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

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

"That whereas Alamo Irrigation Co., of Alamo, Nev., under date of August 7, 1946, executed its promissory note to the United States for $46,200 for moneys advanced on that date by the United States for the purpose of lining its irrigation canals and installing therein certain turn-out structures pursuant to an act of August 28, 1937, entitled 'An act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes' (50 Stat. 869); and

"Whereas Alamo Irrigation Co. was not permitted to use the funds advanced unless countersigned by a duly authorized representative of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

"Whereas Alamo Irrigation Co. was unable to obtain bids within the limits of available funds for lining the canals and was further delayed from the use of such funds by the necessity of transporting irrigation water until the 1947 crops were matured.

"Interest which accrued on said note from August 7, 1946, to June 17, 1947, in the sum of $1,193.50 is hereby waived and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause the proper entries to be made in the accounting records of the Department of Agriculture to effect such waiver."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to waive the collection of interest in the amount of $1,193.50 on a loan made by the Secretary to the Alamo Irrigation Co. for that period which the company was unable to use the principal amount of the loan.

STATEMENT

The facts are fully set forth in the attached letters received from the Department of Justice and the Department of Agriculture:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
June 14, 1948.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request for the views of this Department relative to the bill (S. 2049) for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.

The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to credit the note for $46,200, executed by the Alamo Irrigation Co., of Alamo, Nev., dated August 7, 1946, with the sum of $1,193.50, representing the interest accrued thereon from August 7, 1946, to June 17, 1947, during which time such corporation was prevented from applying the funds for which such note was given to the contemplated purpose of lining a canal, first by the impossibility of securing acceptable bids therefor during the fall months of 1946, and thereafter by the necessity of using the existing canal to transport irrigation water to farms until the 1947 crops were matured.

In compliance with your request, a report was obtained from the Department of Agriculture concerning this legislation. That report, which is enclosed, states that the Alamo Irrigation Co. applied to the Department of Agriculture for assistance pursuant to the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 869), for the purpose of lining irrigation canals of that company and installing necessary turn-out structures. A loan in the amount of $46,200 was made to the company and funds were advanced on August 7, 1946. The company was unable to use such funds immediately because all construction bids were in excess of available funds and had to be rejected. With the approval of the Department of Agriculture the construction plans were then redrafted and the company undertook to do the construction on its own account in accordance with revised plans but further delay was encountered by reason of the necessity of using the existing canals for the remaining period of the then current crop season. The loan funds advanced to the borrower were deposited in a bank account subject to withdrawal only upon countersignature of representatives of the Government. Consequently, no funds were expended until final plans were made for the construction of the project within the total funds available. The first loan money was expended by the company on June 17, 1947, but during the interim, interest accrued at the rate of 3 percent per annum aggregating $1,193.50.

The Department of Agriculture states it has no authority to adjust or modify the agreement with the claimant company to relieve it from any part of the accrued interest which resulted from the unavoidable delay. It is pointed out, however, that since this loan was made, procedures have been revised in order to prevent the recurrence of this type of situation. The Department of Agriculture states it has no objection in this instance to the enactment of the bill directing that the note of the company be credited with the specified amount of accrued interest.

The bill as presently drawn does not state that the note in question was made to the United States or that moneys under it were actually advanced. In addition, the advisability of a statutory finding of impossibility of obtaining acceptable bids appears doubtful. Should the bill be enacted, it is recommended that it be amended by striking out all matter after the enacting clause and substituting therefor the following:

"That whereas Alamo Irrigation Co., of Alamo, Nev., under date of August 7, 1946, executed its promissory note to the United States for $46,200 for moneys advanced on that date by the United States for the purpose of lining its irrigation canals and installing therein certain turn-out structures pursuant to an act of August 28, 1937, entitled 'An act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes' (50 Stat. 869); and

"Whereas Alamo Irrigation Co. was not permitted to use the funds advanced unless countersigned by a duly authorized representative of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

"Whereas Alamo Irrigation Co. was unable to obtain bids within the limits of available funds for lining the canals and was further delayed from the use of such funds by the necessity of transporting irrigation water until the 1947 crops were matured.

"Interest which accrued on said note from August 7, 1946, to June 17, 1947, in the sum of $1,193.50 is hereby waived and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause the proper entrees to be made in the accounting records of the Department of Agriculture to effect such waiver."

Whether such legislation should be enacted presents a question of legislative policy concerning which the Department of Justice desires to make no recommendation.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of the report.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
March 2, 1948.

The honorable the ATTORNEY GENERAL.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In response to Mr. Ford's request of February 3, 1948, concerning private bill S. 2049, for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co., I am pleased to submit the views of this Department with respect to that bill.

The Alamo Irrigation Co. applied to this Department for assistance pursuant to the act of August 28, 1937, entitled "An act to promote conservation in the arid and semi-arid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes" (50 Stat. 869, 16 U. S. C. 590r-x), for the purpose of lining existing irrigation canals of that company and the installation of necessary turn-out structures. A loan in the amount of $46,200 was made to the company and funds were advanced on August 7, 1946. The company was unable to use the funds immediately because construction bids submitted to it by contractors were all in excess of available funds. The bids were, therefore, rejected by the company. The construction plans were then redrafted with the approval of the Department, and the borrower undertook to do the construction on its own account in accordance with the revised plans. Further delay in beginning construction was encountered by reason of the necessity of using the existing canals for the remaining period of the then current crop season.

Although the loan funds were advanced to the borrower, they were deposited in a bank account subject to withdrawal only upon countersignature of representatives of the Government. Consequently, no funds were expended until final plans were made for the construction of the project within the total funds available. The first loan money was expended by the company on June 17, 1947. During the interim, interest accrued at the rate of 3 percent per annum aggregating $1,193.50.

This Department has no authority to adjust or modify the agreement with the Alamo Irrigation Co. to relieve it from any part of the accrued interest which resulted from the unavoidable delays. Since this loan was made, procedures have been revised in a manner which should prevent the recurrence of this type of situation. There is no objection, however, in this instance to the enactment of the private bill directing that the note of the company be credited with the specified amount of accrued interest.

Sincerely,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

EDWIN A. KNOUS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Edwin A. Knous, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the explanatory statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2120) for the relief of Edwin A. Knous, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edwin A. Knous of Ruth, Nev., the sum of $120.05 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for travel allowance and subsistence due for traveling on orders dated April 16, 1943, from San Francisco, Calif., to Miami, Fla., while a seaman second class in the United States Navy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MALONE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE

This bill is being introduced for the relief of Edwin A. Knous, for the sum of $120.05 for travel allowance and subsistence due for traveling on orders while a seaman second class in the United States Navy (orders dated April 16, 1943) from San Francisco to Miami.

Due to the length of time involved from the date the travel was performed, the Navy Department has been unable to locate sufficient information to substantiate this claim. At the time of this travel, Edwin A. Knous inadvertently turned his receipts over to the transfer yeoman in Miami. Upon requesting their return, they could not be found.

Therefore, since the Navy Department under the law is unable to reimburse him without the receipts and orders, and since the amount mentioned is rightfully due him for travel expenses incurred while on orders while in the United States Navy, this bill is introduced for his relief.

MRS. LUCILLE (SWETT) BROWN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille (Swett) Brown, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the explanatory statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2121) for the relief of Mrs. Lucille (Swett) Brown, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (39 Stat. 742, U. S. C., title 5, secs. 751-791), the late Floyd Swett, of Elko, Nev., who died in an airplane crash on August 13, 1944, near Elko, Nev., while performing contract services for the Grazing Service of the Department of the Interior, shall be deemed to have been a civil employee of the United States within the purview of such act at the time of his death, and compensation for death payable under such act shall accrue from the date of his death and shall be payable to such of his dependents as may qualify under section 10 of such act, under the conditions therein provided, such compensation to be computed in the manner prescribed by such act as if at the time of his death the said Floyd Swett was receiving a monthly pay of $275. No right to benefits shall accrue under this act unless a written claim for compensation is filed under such act of September 7, 1916, within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lucille (Swett) Brown, of Bakersfield, Calif., the sum of $1,500. Such sum represents the value of an airplane owned by the late Floyd Swett, deceased husband of the said Lucille (Swett) Brown, which was destroyed in a crash on August 13, 1944, near Elko, Nev., while in the service of the Grazing Service of the Department of the Interior, and in which, as a result of such crash, her husband was killed: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MALONE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE

This bill is introduced to compensate Mrs. Lucille Swett Brown in the amount of $1,500, which represents the amount due in payment of an airplane owned by her husband which was completely demolished in an accident. The airplane was under contract to the Grazing Service of the Department of the Interior at the time of the accident, with a contract agreement that the plane would be returned to the owner "in as good condition as when received, reasonable wear and tear excepted."

Mr. Swett was killed in the accident, and the plane was demolished. The balance due in payment of the demolished plane is being paid by Mrs. Lucille Swett Brown at great personal sacrifice.

COLORADO RIVER WATER SUPPLY—CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT—INCLUDING PROJECTS IN NEVADA, NEW MEXICO, AND UTAH

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce at this time a Senate joint resolution providing for the appointment of a board of engineers to examine and report upon the water supply available each of the five lower basin States, proposed Central Valley project in Arizona, including the projects in Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah.

This joint resolution has a precedent. At the time of the proposed construction of the Boulder Dam, now known as the Hoover Dam, the seven basin States of the Colorado River had reached an impasse so far as an agreement upon the division of water was concerned as between the upper and the lower basin in the same manner as the lower basin States are presently unable to agree upon a division of the lower basin water supply among the separate States.

Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, at that time introduced a bill which later became the act of May 29, 1928, Forty-fifth Statutes, page 1011, providing for the creation of the Sibert Board to report on the feasibility of Boulder Dam, to be authorized under the Boulder Dam Project Act. This resolution refers to Senate Joint Resolution No. 75, which is now pending before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) to appoint a board of engineers to examine and report upon the proposed central Arizona project, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it will be remembered that the Sibert "Colorado River Board," appointed under the Pittman Act and headed by Gen. William L. Sibert, included Charles P. Berkey, Daniel W. Mead, Warren J. Mead, and Robert Ridgeway, all nationally known and recognized consulting engineers.

This bill provides that the President shall appoint such a board of eminent engineers to examine the controversy regarding the division of the waters allocated to the lower basin by the Colorado River compact, since it seems unlikely that a five-State compact can be arrived at within a reasonable time.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1275) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, which has for its purpose the bringing under the Social Security Act officers and employees of a State employment security agency in the same manner and to the same extent as though they were employees of the United States.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF EIGHTY-FOUR ESTONIANS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BALDWIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1513) for the relief of 84 Estonians, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar:

H. R. 559. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Central Division of the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the city of Needles, Calif., and the California-Pacific Utilities Co.;

H. R. 571. An act for the relief of Bankers & Shippers Insurance Co.;

H. R. 632. An act for the relief of John E. Burns;

H. R. 1017. An act for the relief of John Aaron Whitt;

H. R. 1019. An act for the relief of George M. Ford;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of the Jansson Gage Co.;

H. R. 1054. An act for the relief of the Riegel Textile Corp.;

H. R. 1055. An act for the relief of Agnese R. Mundy;

H. R. 1282. An act for the relief of Mrs. T. A. Robertson;

H. R. 1458. An act for the relief of Joseph R. Gregory;

H. R. 1601. An act for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc.;

H. R. 1782. An act for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grissinger;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Charles E. Ader;

H. R. 1795. An act for the relief of Lewyt Corp.;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of the estate of Josephine Pereira;

H. R. 2090. An act for the relief of Sam Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Alethea Arthur;

H. R. 2095. An act for the relief of the estate of Kenneth N. Peel;

H. R. 2253. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur Earl Troiel, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 2456. An act for the relief of Charlie Hales;

H. R. 2530. An act for the relief of James R. Frazer;

H. R. 2806. An act for the relief of Paul C. Juneau;

H. R. 2807. An act for the relief of Loretta B. Powell;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Ida Hoheisel, executrix of the estate of John Hoheisel;

H. R. 3139. An act for the relief of James B. DeHart;

H. R. 3408. An act for the relief of Opal Hayes and D. A. Hayes;

H. R. 3501. An act for the relief of Nelson Bell;

H. R. 4804. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker; and

H. R. 5018. An act for the relief of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2592. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John White Bear a patent in fee to certain lands;

H. R. 2706. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Susie Larvie Dillon;

H. R. 2920. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to George Swift Horse; and

H. R. 4254. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Sidney Blackhair; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2848. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND TO CALIFORNIA SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the California Savings and Loan League, at San Francisco, June 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MALONE ON THE IMPACT OF FREE TRADE ON AMERICAN LABOR AND INDUSTRY

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject The Impact of Free Trade on American Labor and Industry, broadcast by him from Washington, D. C., on June 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FAILURE OF DENAZIFICATION—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Denazification Fails, German Editor Says," written by John London and published in the Washington Post on June 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISCLOSURE OF SECRET FBI FILES IN JUDITH COPLON TRIAL—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Too High a Price," published in the Washington Daily News of June 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOUTHERN KEY TO HOUSING—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Southern Key to Housing," published in the New York Times of June 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES—EDITORIAL FROM THE ILLINOIS STATE REGISTER

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding economic conditions in the United States, from the Illinois State Register for June 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. BYRNES DISSENTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND NEWS LEADER

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Byrnes Dissents," published in the Richmond News Leader of June 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

DENAZIFICATION PROGRAM IN GERMANY—RADIO INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR GILLETTE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the transcript of a radio program of June 19, 1949, dealing with the denazification program in Germany, on which program Senator GILLETTE was interviewed by Ed Hart, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT COLLEGE GROWS UP—ARTICLE BY ROBERT LASCH

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Roosevelt College Grows Up" written by Mr. Robert Lasch, and published in the magazine New Republic, of June 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GROWING UNEMPLOYMENT MUST BE STOPPED, WESTERN INDUSTRIES REQUIRE PROTECTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WATKINS

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Growing Unemployment Must Be Stopped, Western Industries Require Protection," delivered by him on April 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT PAY ROLLS IN UTAH—EDITORIAL FROM THE DESERET NEWS

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Government Pay Rolls in Utah," published in the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, June 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

KNOTTY PROBLEM IN HOUSING OUTLOOK—EDITORIAL FROM THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Knotty Problem in Housing Outlook," published in the Salt Lake Tribune, June 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF MORGAN FORD, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 30, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Morgan Ford, of North Dakota, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice William J. Tilson, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Finance Committee will be in session tomorrow, and it probably will be necessary to sit after 12 o'clock for an hour or so longer. I therefore ask that the Senate Finance Committee be permitted to sit tomorrow afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. MAYBANK, a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee holding hearings on proposed RFC legislation was granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, the Committee on Public Works was granted permission to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3082) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BATES of Kentucky, Mr. YATES, Mr. FURCOLO, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. STOCKMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4392) to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by the United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for himself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the so-called Thomas substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Monday I started a speech on the pending emergency-dispute proposals which are before the Senate, and I was unable to complete that part of the speech which deals with an analysis of labor's objections to the injunctive process in settling labor disputes. It is not my intention to speak at great length this afternoon. Unless there are a great many interruptions I think I can complete the discussion of the injunction issue, as I see that issue, in an hour or less.

In my speech of Monday I sought for the benefit of the Senate to bring together at one place in the RECORD a comparative analysis of the Douglas, Ives, Taft, and Morse proposals for the handling of emergency disputes. I do not intend to summarize that analysis at great length, other than to answer at this time certain inquiries which have been directed to me since the speech of Monday.

The most common inquiry from Members of the Senate, as well as from labor and industrial leaders, is this: Will you reemphasize the major points of difference between your proposal and the Douglas proposal? I shall take 2 or 3 minutes to do that at this time.

Mr. President, we need to keep in mind the fact that both the Douglas and the Morse proposals call for a Presidential proclamation certifying that a national emergency affecting public health and safety is either threatened or in fact exists. Second, they call for the appointment of an emergency board, with the obligation of making recommendations on the merits of the dispute. We should keep in mind the fact that those recommendations will, to all intents and purposes, be a decision on the merits of the case. I care not what language is used to describe those recommendations otherwise. When an emergency board conducts hearings on the merits of a dispute and hands down a report setting forth its findings of fact and its recommendations for the settlement of the dispute, I say that that report in fact constitutes a decision on the merits of the dispute. I wish to be very careful to make that clear in my remarks, because I do not desire to mislead anyone as to what my intention is with respect to my proposal for handling emergency disputes. I emphasize the fact that I believe it is the decision that counts. It is the decision that is important in the settlement of all labor disputes, including emergency disputes. The fact that both the Douglas and the Morse proposals place upon the Emergency Board the duty of coming forward with a decision on the merits of the dispute, provides for a procedure which will settle practically all the cases which have to be submitted to an emergency board. That has been our experience under the Railway Labor Act; and with the public discussion and the public point of view which have developed, particularly in the past 2 or 3 years, we can be even more sure that practically all emergency disputes will be settled on the basis of the findings and decisions of the Emergency Board.

After the decision of the Emergency Board, the differences between the Douglas proposal and the Morse proposal begin to develop. Under the Douglas proposal the President would have the authority to proceed with seizure of the plant or industry. Under the Morse proposal the President would be under obligation to lay the matter before the Congress, on the theory that if, in fact, a national emergency is threatened, or exists, and if it endangers the health and safety of the people of the Nation, the President should be required to present the matter to the Congress.

(At this point Mr. MORSE yielded to Mr. LUCAS and other Senators, whose remarks, on request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, appear at the conclusion of Mr. MORSE's speech.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator a question. He has referred in discussing the Douglas amendment and the Morse amendment to the emergency boards which are set up, one by each of those respective amendments. As I recall, he also referred to the fact that the President, under the Morse amendment, is obliged to submit to Congress a full statement of the case. I should like to inquire whether I am correct in my understanding that, under the Morse amendment, the President is not obliged to wait until after the Emergency Board shall have made its finding before he is to submit to Congress the full statement of the case.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Missouri. He has raised the very next question I was about to discuss in my summary description of the Morse proposal as contrasted with the Douglas proposal, and I will answer him by reading from page 4 of my proposal, section 303 (a), beginning in line 4:

SEC. 303. (a) At any time after issuing a proclamation pursuant to section 301 the President may submit to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make.

(b) In any case in which a strike or lockout occurs or continues after the issuance of the proclamation pursuant to section 301 the President shall submit immediately to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case, including the report of the Emergency Board if such report has been made, and such recommenda-

tions as he may see fit to make, including a recommendation that the United States take possession of and operate the business enterprise or enterprises involved in the dispute. If the President recommends that the United States shall take possession of and operate such enterprise or enterprises, the President shall have authority to take such action unless the Congress by concurrent resolution within 10 days after the submission of such recommendation to the Congress determines that such action should not be taken or enacts legislation designed to resolve the dispute and terminate the national emergency if Congress finds such an emergency exists.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Then am I correct in understanding from the portion of the Morse amendment which the Senator has read that in any case in which a strike or lock-out occurs or continues after the issuance of the proclamation pursuant to section 301, it is the obligation of the President, without waiting for the Emergency Board to make a finding or recommendatilon, if it has not previously made one, to submit immediately to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case?

Mr. MORSE. That is true, and I think it constitutes one of the great advantages and strong points of my amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Referring now to the Douglas amendment, am I correct in understanding that under that amendment it is provided that a separate Emergency Board shall be appointed and that, in like manner as is true under the Morse amendment, the President is not required to wait until after the finding or report has been made by the Emergency Board, before he is authorized to take possession of and operate the properties through an agency or department of the Government?

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding of the meaning of the Douglas amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his inquiry.

Mr. President, I was saying that it is in regard to what follows after the emergency board report that we begin to see what I consider to be very significant differences between the Morse amendment and the Douglas amendment. I stress those differences because, speaking from my own biased authorship, I believe they show the great superiority of the Morse amendment over the Douglas proposal. Under the Morse amendment, after the emergency board has made its report, if either party is responsible for a defiance of the Government—and that is what it constitutes at that point—then the President shall lay the matter before the Congress with such recommendations as he thinks appropriate, including if he wishes a recommendation for seizure; and if the Congress within 10 days does not deny his seizure power, he can proceed to seize. The Government then, with the property in its possession, is authorized to proceed to put into effect such terms and conditions as the Government thinks would be fair and reasonable, in conformity with the recommendations of the emergency board. Yet, under the Morse amendment, Congress will be in a position at that time to lay down the terms and conditions which it thinks, from the standpoint of ending the national emergency, should be applied to the Government operation of the plant.

There are those, as was pointed out on the floor previously, who seem to think that that constitutes compulsory arbitration. There is Government compulsion, but there is no compulsory arbitration about it. The voluntarism of the parties is left. It is up to them to determine whether they want to cooperate with their Government during that period, whether they want to go along with the emergency board report, without stoppage of work; and, of course, they will not be in any difficulty with the Government if there is no stoppage of work. Under the Morse proposal, after the emergency board reports, in the absence of a stoppage of work there is plenty of time for the parties to continue their negotiations without any Government seizure whatsoever, and to continue conciliatory and mediation efforts to reach a good-faith collective-bargaining agreement. But, Mr. President, if we are actually presented with a set of facts making it necessary, in the public interest, in the opinion of the President of the United States and of the Congress of the United States, to proceed to operate a plant or industry in order to protect public health and safety, then, certainly, the Government should be in a position to lay down terms and conditions which, in the opinion of the Government, are fair and reasonable and which result in a fair settlement of the dispute on the merits for the duration of the Government operation of the plant.

What I stated before I stress today, that that, in my judgment, is one of the great strengths of the Morse amendment. The objections of some labor leaders to it, on the ground that it constitutes compulsory arbitration, are, I think, only a red herring. There is no compulsory arbitration about it, but only the exercise of the right of the Government, for the period it has assumed the obligation of operating the plant, to determine what the Government wages, hours, and conditions of employment shall be for that period.

As I have stated, it keeps the parties in doubt as to what is going to happen. If they permit good-faith collective bargaining to break down and permit themselves to get into a position in which the Government has to take over the plant in order to protect the health and safety of American citizens, I think they should be kept in doubt. The fact that under the Morse amendment they will not know for a certainty what the final outcome will be if the Government has to take the extreme step of Government seizure and operation is one of the great virtues of my amendment and is one of the things which will cause the parties to think not once, or twice, but hundreds of times, over and over again, before they follow such a course of action after an Emergency Board, for example, has handed down a decision after a fair hearing on the merits. They will think hundreds of times before they will say, "We defy our Government. We refuse to accept that decision. We are going to endanger the health and the safety of the American people." We get comparative values there, Mr. President, to a comparison of the great social and economic values.

We are confronted, then, in a democratic society with the question whether, at that point, for the period of Government operation—and I emphasize the words "for the period of Government operation"—any employers or any group of workers ought to consider that they have the right to say, "Irrespective of the Government's wishes under this situation, even after we have had a fair hearing and a decision on the merits, we are going to endanger the public health and safety." Certainly, Mr. President, at that point—and I want the labor leaders to mark this language—I am perfectly willing to stand up and be counted in support of the proposition that they lose their equities insofar as their insistence that the status quo be protected. They object to maintaining the status quo in a great many other factual situations, because their argument—and it is a good one in many situations—is that it was the status quo that caused the dispute in the first place. But after the Government reaches the point of giving it the type of consideration and handling which is provided for in my amendment, then the Government formula will apply for the period of the seizure and operation by the Government. That is not Government compulsory arbitration. In my judgment, it is the exercise of the inherent managerial right of the Government, under those circumstances, to operate the plant on the basis of the wages, hours, and working conditions it considers to be fair and necessary to end the emergency, and thereby to protect the national health and safety.

That is not provided for in the Douglas amendment. What happens under the Douglas amendment? It gives the boys a chance to work their strategy against each other. When I say "the boys" I mean the boys on both sides of the collective-bargaining table, management and labor. Under the Douglas amendment, if the labor group, for example, thinks it can embarrass the management, can follow a course of action which will be costly to the management, it knows that by forcing the management into a Government seizure the hours, wages, and working conditions will not be changed from the status quo which preceded the seizure and which existed at the time the dispute arose. So there can be—and I shall not take the time to describe the hypothetical facts, because I think we can all take notice of them—factual situations in which it will be to

the advantage of labor to force management into a position in which the Government will seize. That is not fair to management. Because, in my opinion, the Douglas amendment in this respect is not fair to management I am against it.

Conversely, we can all imagine factual situations in which it would be to the advantage, under the Douglas amendment, for employers, management, to force the Government into seizure. When we look to the compensation formula set out in the Douglas amendment in which a fair return is guaranteed, and a business may be declining or may be in the red, there are factual situations in which it may be to the selfish interest of the employer in that particular case to force a Government seizure, particularly if the management does not like the recommendations of the emergency board. Therefore, under the Douglas amendment the workers would be required, in the situation mentioned, to work for the wages and observe the hours and the working conditions which gave rise to the dispute in the first instance, because under the Douglas amendment the Government during the seizure period could not change the conditions of employment, irrespective of the decision and findings of the emergency board.

I say that is not fair; it is not fair in that instance to labor, and all I ever insisted upon, in labor legislation, was that we find a middle-road position whereby a procedure may be provided which is equally fair and equally applicable to both labor and management. I say in this respect the Douglas amendment falls short.

There is another difference, a vital difference. Under the Morse amendment the Norris-LaGuardia Act applies unless the Congress by concurrent resolution specifically excepts the particular case from the operation of that act. Under the Douglas amendment, as is admitted by its author, the Government would be free to proceed to get injunctions automatically, using as the basic authority—and I think correctly—the United Mine Workers case decided by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, that brings us to grips with the question as to whether or not labor wants to support an amendment which automatically produces an injunction under the terms of the amendment. Oh, I have talked to some labor leaders in the last 48 hours and they do not like that phase of it. But what is their fallacious argument? It is that, "We might get something worse." I have said to those labor leaders privately what I now say to them publicly, "You had better make up your minds whether you are willing to stand for a principle and see it through, or run out on a principle because you might get something worse."

I am a little weary of the double talk which has been presented to me in the past 48 hours by some labor leaders. When they sit in my office or in the reception room and tell me that they will never stand for the principle of injunction as a means for settling labor disputes, and I ask them, "What about the Douglas amendment?" They say, "That is what we do not like about it, but we do not think you have the votes for your amendment, and we do not think the Senator from New York has the votes for his amendment." In each instance I have laughingly said to them, "I will offer you a wager. I will give you a dollar for every vote you get for the Douglas amendment over 25, and you are to give me a dollar for every vote you fall short of 25, if you want to put it on that plane." Never in the Senate of the United States am I going to act on that plane.

The Douglas amendment either is a sound amendment or it is not, and if it is not a sound amendment, I say to the labor leaders of America that they should be opposing it, as industry should be opposing it. In my judgment there ought to be a united opposition on the part of American labor leaders and leaders of American industry to the Douglas amendment, because in my judgment the Douglas amendment has in it so many serious dangers to a free economy that I cannot be a party to it.

I shall not be a party to an automatic injunctive proceeding for reasons which I shall set forth later in this speech, even for a 60-day period, or any period of time. The result of the automatic injunctive procedure will be to build up again a habit of thinking that because an injunction does break a strike, it is a good thing. I have no doubt that it will break a strike. If you want to end strikes in America, if that is your objective, if you want to make certain that you can bring to their knees labor organizations involved in a labor dispute, which might possibly under some circumstances and facts lead to endangering national health and safety, you can do it by the injunctive process, but oh, at what a price, at what a price of bitter resentment and continued industrial unrest. That is why I shall not be a party to that section of the amendment.

Neither, Mr. President, shall I be a party to an amendment which does not put the Government in such a position that during the period of the procedure, it cannot lay down fair terms applicable to industry and labor.

Then, Mr. President, there is the third great difference between the Morse and Douglas amendments, the difference in respect to the provisions as to what industry will get in case of Government seizure, with labor at fault. Read the Douglas amendment. Is management going to get a full return on its business in an instance in which labor is in defiance of the Government, and refuses to accept a fair and reasonable emergency board decision It is not. It is going to get only, under the very restricted legal formula, a fair return for the use of the property, which may be much less than management would get if it were allowed to get full return from the use of its property during the period of seizure.

I say that that section of the Douglas amendment—and mark these words—puts the Government on labor's side of the table; it gives labor a club by which it can force an industry into Government seizure, to the great financial cost and sacrifice of the employer. That is not fair or just. I shall not be a party to it. I am going to insist, as I said the other day, that the Government be on neither side of the table, but at the head of the table. If the parties allow collective bargaining to break down so that the Government has to step into the picture to protect national health and safety, then I want my Government at the head of the table, not on either side.

That feature of the Douglas amendment puts the Government in a coercive position, on labor's side of the table, against management, and that is not right. Representatives of labor know that. In private conversation they admit it, as they have admitted it to me. My reply to them in private conversation is exactly my reply to them from this desk now, "Don't ask me to vote for a procedure that is one-sided and unfair, because I will not do it."

Mr. President, I have stated the three great differences between the Douglas and the Morse amendments. I think they are differences so great that they clearly show the superiority of the Morse amendment, if we are seeking to protect the public interest, and provide for a procedure which is fair and workable.

I wish to address the remainder of my remarks to the question of our experience in the past with the injunctive process. In order to ward off any misunderstanding as to whether or not this argument is applicable to the situation which will develop under emergency dispute cases, I hasten to say at the outset that it is not completely applicable, because of the restrictions and the limitations which surround the use of the injunction, by way of a time period, under the Taft proposal. Nevertheless, the arguments I shall now make against the use of the injunction are apropos, in my opinion, because of the fact that if the injunction is used in emergency disputes it will become increasingly difficult to draw a clear line of distinction between a dispute that is an emergency dispute and one that is not.

We are also going to find developing a pattern and habit of public thinking along this line: "If the injunction ends strikes in emergency disputes, then let us extend it to other disputes." And I think it will in the course of time be extended to other disputes in two ways. First, by way of discretionary action on the part of those who decide whether or not a dispute does affect national health and safety; and second, by future legislation.

Thus I say we ought to take a stand at this session of Congress against any weakening whatsoever of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and we ought to make perfectly clear that the only exception we propose to make to the Norris-LaGuardia Act in respect to emergency disputes will be the instance in which the Congress itself, by concurrent resolution, after consideration of a particular case, reaches the conclusion that the case should be excepted from the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I do not deny it may reach such a conclusion, but a set of facts on which it could be based are very difficult for me to imagine. That is the provision of my amendment.

I have some question whether it is germane for me to make this suggestion at this time, but as one who is going to continue to do everything within his power

to develop within the Republican Party a constructive, forward-looking program which will deserve support of the millions of independent voters whose support we have not had for some years gone by, I wish to suggest to my party that I think, as in 1932, so today, we ought to make perfectly clear that we stand for the principles of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and we do not propose to weaken them or break them down by the adoption of the injunctive process, even in connection with emergency disputes; and that we reserve the right on the part of the Congress, which it has without our reservation of course, to make an exception, but that the only exception we would ever consider would be a particular case, the facts and circumstances of which would lead the Congress to believe after due deliberation, that it should be excepted.

Now there is a definite plank for the Republican Party, not because it is a good political issue, but because it is right. I recommend to the Republican Party that we make it a political issue. If we do not, other forces will anyway. Let us not overlook the fact that the action we as Republicans take at this session of Congress in the Senate of the United States, is going to confront us in 1950 and 1952. I like so well the soundness of the position my party took on the Norris-LaGuardia Act that I am not willing to retreat from it.

Thus I direct the attention of the Senate to some of the experiences this country had when it was quite appropriate to say that labor was confronted in its employer-employee relationships with government by injunction.

THE USE OF INJUNCTIONS TO BREAK STRIKES

Experience prior to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act made it crystal clear that the mere issuance of a preliminary injunction or an ex parte restraining order was often, in and of itself, sufficient to break a strike, even before the union had the slightest opportunity for its day in court to show the legality and propriety of its action. As stated in Frankfurter and Greene, which has become generally recognized as the standard textbook, so to speak, of government by injunction, published in 1930, entitled "The Labor Injunction," pages 200–201:

> The restraining order and the preliminary injunction invoked in labor disputes reveal the most crucial points of legal maladjustment. Temporary injunctive relief without notice, or, if upon notice, relying upon dubious affidavits, serves the important function of staying defendant's conduct regardless of the ultimate justification of such restraint. The preliminary proceedings, in other words, make the issue of final relief a practical nullity. Undoubtedly, the law is here confronted with a very perplexing situation. Where the plaintiff on the surface presents a meritorious case, he should not be exposed to the peril of irreparable damage before the court can make available to him its slower, though much more scrutinizing, processes of fact finding. This form of relief presents no difficulty when the temporary suspension of defendant's activities results in no very great damage to him, at least no damage that cannot be adequately compensated by money, security for which is provided by plaintiff's bond. In labor cases, however, complicating factors enter. The injunction cannot preserve the so-called status quo; the situation does not remain in equilibrium awaiting judgment upon full knowledge. The suspension of activities affects only the strikers; the employer resumes his efforts to defeat the strike, and resumes them free from the interdicted interferences.

Mr. President, I digress from the quotation to underline that point. The injunction affects workers primarily. It does not stop the employer from carrying on his practices, which result usually, after the injunction, in the breaking of the strike.

Returning to Frankfurter and Greene:

> Moreover, the suspension of strike activities, even temporarily, may defeat the strike for practical purposes and foredoom its resumption, even if the injunction is later lifted. Choice is not between irreparable damage to one side and compensable damage to the other. The law's conundrum is which side should bear the risk of unavoidable irreparable damage. * * * For this situation the ordinary mechanics of the provisional injunction proceedings are plainly inadequate. Judicial error is too costly to either side of a labor dispute to permit perfunctory determination of the crucial issues; even in the first instance, it must be searching.

That is what two recognized authorities on labor law and labor relations have to say in the recognized book on this subject, and one of them, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, now sits on the United States Supreme Court.

The instances where preliminary injunctions and restraining orders have proved fatal to strikes are legion. Unfortunately, however, reliable statistics concerning such instances are not available. The reason is quite obvious. The issuance of a preliminary injunction or restraining order is not ordinarily reflected in the printed court reports. And most such injunctions and orders never ripen into permanent injunctions. Moreover, a surprisingly large number of the latter type of injunctions are never the subject of appeal. As stated in Senate Report No. 1060, Seventy-first Congress, second session, part 2, page 7:

> A large majority of injunction proceedings are never carried beyond a restraining order or temporary injunction and, therefore, are unlikely ever to reach the state of official reporting which is concerned largely with final decrees and with decisions of appellate courts.

Thus, of 88 temporary injunctions issued by Federal district courts in labor disputes, Frankfurter and Greene, supra, page 79, found that 68 were never appealed from, while 56 of them, whether appealed or not, never went to final hearing on the merits.

They also found that of 35 temporary injunctions issued in New York during the 5-year period of 1923–27, in no instance were there further proceedings. Such figures led the authors to state—pages 79–80:

> These statistics reveal a situation peculiar to labor disputes. The strike—this is true in a great many of the cases—may have ended; the strikers may lack funds for litigation; the strikers may be convinced that there is nothing to be gained by fighting injunctions issued by judges who are hostile to organized labor. Whatever the reason, it is undeniably the fact that the preliminary injunction in the main determines and terminates the controversy in court. The tentative truth results in making ultimate truth irrelevant.

I reread the last sentence:

> The tentative truth results in making ultimate truth irrelevant.

Despite the lack of over-all statistics, however, there are many recorded examples of cases in which injunctions of a preliminary character have in fact ended strikes, regardless of the actual merit of the strikers' position. Frankfurter and Greene are again the best source of such examples. (See pp. 97–105.) Many decrees in the past have directly prohibited the calling or conduct of strikes. In 1919, for example, at the instance of the Attorney General of the United States, Judge Anderson of the Federal district court in Indiana issued without opinion a remarkable decree forbidding a threatened strike. Officers of the United Mine Workers "and all other persons whomsoever" were restrained from giving any message regarding the strike, from "doing any further act whatsoever," from "issuing any further strike orders," from "issuing any instructions, written or oral," from "issuing any messages of encouragement or exhortation," and from paying strike benefits. Needless to say, under that injunction the strike never materialized.

In 1927, Judge Schoonmaker of the Federal court in Pennsylvania enjoined striking miners who lived in homes owned by the management—

> from disbursing any funds for any further appeal bonds, attorney services, court costs, or otherwise for the purpose of enabling, aiding, encouraging or procuring any person to occupy against the plaintiff's will any such mining houses of plaintiff; from signing any further appeal bond or depositing, providing, or furnishing security for such appeal bond to prolong or aid in litigation respecting the possession of said houses.

How do you like that, Mr. President? When labor is confronted with the danger in the injunctive process of such a restriction upon the movements of free citizens, is it any wonder that labor is seeking to make clear to the Eighty-first Congress that never will its cooperation be obtained in support of a procedure which gives to the Federal judiciary such sweeping powers? I say that without that cooperation we are headed for a class struggle in America. Without that cooperation we cannot hope to have industrial peace, with millions upon millions of workers convinced that the Government has done them wrong. That is the position of American labor on the injunctive process; and it seems to me that far-seeing industrial statesmen among American employers should recognize it before it is too late. They should take the heat off the Eighty-first Congress for the passage of injunctive legislation. I say to Members of Congress that I think they ought to stand up against the drive which is being made to return to the injunctive process as a general pattern available for us in the case of emergency disputes.

In one reported case, *Western Union Tel. Co.* v. *International B. of E. Workers* (2 Fed. 2d 993, aff'd 6 F. 444), the

defendants were enjoined by a Federal court in Illinois—

from striking or threatening to strike against any person, firm, or corporation for the purpose of inducing such person, firm, or corporation to stop or prevent complainant working on his, their, or its premises, and thereby of preventing said plaintiff from performing its contracts * * * and of compelling it to discharge its employees who are not members of labor unions which are affiliated with said defendants.

In 1928, in the unreported case of *Lubliner & Trintz Theatres, Inc.* v. *Chicago Fed. of Musicians*, the same court restrained employees—

from leaving or threatening to leave the employment of said complainant, either by way of strike or otherwise, unless with the consent of said complainant, for the purpose of forcing or coercing said complainant to agree to * * * said demands or any of them.

Mr. President, if that did not constitute involuntary servitude, then I am at a loss to understand how one would define it.

In other cases, unions have been enjoined from paying strike benefits and from rendering assistance to strikers or workmen about to go on strike (*Portland Terminal Co.* v. *Foss* (283 Fed. 204 (Maine, 1922)); *Indianapolis Street Ry. Co.* v. *Armstrong* (D. Ind., 1926); union officials have been commanded to call off effective strikes (*Selden Breck Construction Co.* v. *Blair* (N. D. Ohio, 1925)); *Selden Breck Construction Co.* v. *Local No. 263* (D. Nebr., 1925)); strikers have been enjoined from all persuasion, from peaceful patrolling, and from attempts to give publicity to the facts of a dispute. Thus in the so-called Chicago Injunction case, referred to and reproduced in a marginal note to the opinion of *Cohen* v. *U. S.* (295 Fed. 633, 636), the strikers were enjoined from—

in any manner, with intent to further said conspiracy, by letters, printed or other circulars, telegrams, telephones, word of mouth, oral persuasion, or communication, or through interviews published in newspapers, or other similar acts, encouraging, directing, or commanding any person, whether a member of any or either of said labor organizations or associations defendant herein, to abandon the employment of said railway companies, or any of them, or to refrain from entering the service of said railway companies, or any of them.

Similarly, the Federal district court in Iowa in 1930 enjoined the defendants from "printing, publishing, issuing, circulating and distributing, or otherwise communicating, directly or indirectly, in writing or verbally to any person, association of persons, or corporation, any statement or notice of any kind or character whatever" stating or representing that there was a strike in progress or that the complainant was unfair to organized labor or that the complainant required the signing of a "yellow-dog contract."

I ask, in respect to that injunction, how can it be squared with the precious right of freedom of speech? It is no answer to say that labor was in a position to take an appeal therefrom. The strike was broken by the injunction. Thus I say that the injunctive process is the most effective strike-breaking weapon the employers can seek to get on their side of the table, because, confronted with a drastic injunction, no labor union is able to survive in a test of economic force with an employer.

Such, then, are the types of decrees of a preliminary character which have been effective in killing strikes, whatever might have been the validity of such decrees had further proceedings been had. By such restraints, the unions were robbed of the chances of exercising the only power they had in the labor disputes—the chance of availing themselves of the lawful, economic weapons of the strike, the picket line, and the like. The temporary delay caused by the preliminary injunctions and restraining orders completely defeated many strikes. As stated in Senate Report No. 1060, Seventy-first Congress, second session, part 2, page 20:

Injunctions are often applied for and issued for the moral effect that such injunctions will have in disheartening and discouraging employees engaged in a strike, rather than because of any real necessity to protect property.

As I said the other day, Mr. President, the effect of the very issuance of an injunction is usually to poison public opinion against the union on strike, because it is only natural, especially when the public, too, is suffering a little inconvenience or considerable economic loss from the strike, for the public to develop a notion that labor must be wrong because an injunction has been issued against it by the court.

The lessons taught by the pre-Norris-LaGuardia Act experience has been reiterated many times in the history of the American labor movement. President Theodore Roosevelt, in his message to Congress on December 3, 1906, said (15 Messages and Papers of the Presidents 7027):

It must be remembered that a preliminary injunction in a labor case, if granted without adequate proof * * * may often settle the dispute between the parties; and therefore if improperly granted may do irreparable wrong * * * there have undoubtedly been flagrant wrongs committed by judges in connection with labor disputes even within the last few years.

The great William Howard Taft, in his speech accepting the Presidential nomination in 1908, stated (Presidential Addresses and State Papers of William Howard Taft 24):

In case of a lawful strike the sending of a formidable document restraining a number of defendants from doing a great many things which the plaintiff avers they are threatening to do, often so discourages men, always reluctant to go into a strike, from continuing what is their lawful right.

A New York court has very aptly phrased the argument. Judge Howard in the case of *Wood Mowing & Reaping M. Co.* v. *Toohey* (114 Misc. 185, 196–197 (N. Y., 1921)), stated:

The courts should not carelessly cast the weight of their mandates into the strife between employers and employees.

In an evenly balanced, bitter, long-drawn-out labor struggle, an edict of the court, leveled at the strikers, shakes the morale of the workingmen. This is not the purpose of the injunction, although it is frequently, and perhaps generally, the purpose of the employer who seeks it. * * * The moral effect of an injunction order in such cases is tremendous. At once it gives the impression in the community that the strikers have violated the law. The court seems to have taken a hand in the struggle. This is the layman's view. The injunction, thus shaping public opinion, is often decisive.

In exercising its discretion the court cannot shut its eyes to this aspect of the case or ignore the far-reaching psychic effect of its mandate.

I do not see how a clearer case against the injunction, as to its effects upon public opinion, could possibly be made. I do not think we could find a clearer statement of that situation than the statement made by Judge Howard in the case to which I have just referred.

Most recently of all, Mr. Justice Murphy, dissenting in the famous case of *United States* v. *United Mine Workers* (330 U. S. 258, 340-341), summarized briefly the evils of labor injunctions:

The issuance of such orders prior to the adoption of the Norris-LaGuardia Act had a long and tortured history. Time and again strikes were broken merely by the issuance of a temporary restraining order, purporting to maintain the status quo. Because of the highly fluid character of labor disputes, the delay involved in testing an order of that nature often resulted in neutralizing the rights of employees to strike and picket. And too often, these orders did more than stabilize existing conditions; they called for affirmative change.

Mr. Justice Murphy in that dissenting opinion has laid down the indictment that I wish to accept and follow in my opposition to the passage in the Eighty-first Congress of legislation which will have in it a provision for an automatic pattern of injunctive process to be used even in so-called emergency disputes. I say that if we are confronted with a case which, in the wise judgment of the Congress, ought to be made an exception to the Norris-LaGuardia Act, it should be done by specific act of the Congress through a concurrent resolution. That is a feature of the Morse amendment and, in my judgment, it is one of the great strengths of the Morse amendment.

Mr. President, let us go back to the Senate committee hearings, as set forth in the report of the committee at the time when the Norris-LaGuardia bill was under debate in the Senate. I refer now to the House reports of the Seventy-second Congress, first session, and I shall read from page 2 of Report No. 669. In speaking of the Norris-LaGuardia bill, the following is stated:

This bill is the so-called anti-injunction bill. It is the outgrowth of years of agitation in the Congress for restriction upon the powers of Federal equity courts in the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes. Hearings have been held by congressional committees over a period of years and the facts adduced have brought about an almost unanimity of opinion that such powers of the Federal courts have been exercised to the detriment of the public welfare and should be curbed.

Strong language, Mr. President, but correct.

I read further:

The questions are sociologic and economic as well as legal and jurisdictional.

The limitation of the jurisdiction of Federal courts to issue injunctions in labor dis-

putes has been a subject of public discussion for many years. It is fair to say that public sentiment on the subject has reached the conclusion that some such limitation is absolutely necessary. Both of the great political parties in their last national platforms have promised remedial legislation upon the subject. The last Republican National Convention at Kansas City adopted a plank on the subject, as follows:

"The party favors freedom in wage contracts, the right of collective bargaining by free and responsible agents of their own choosing, which develops and maintains that purposeful cooperation which gains its chief incentive through voluntary agreement.

"We believe that injunctions in labor disputes have in some instances been abused and have given rise to a serious question for legislation."

Mr. President, that is pretty good for a Republican platform, pretty close to an advance endorsement of the Norris-LaGuardia bill; and to the credit of my party, it was put through under Republican leadership. They made good on that one. I do not wish to destroy it now in the Eighty-first Congress. I wish it to continue to be one of the great, constructive contributions the Republican Party has made to labor-management relations in the United States.

Then the report goes on to say:

Following this, the last Democratic National Convention at Houston, Tex., in its platform, made the following promises:

"(a) We favor the principle of collective bargaining and the Democratic principle that organized labor should choose its own representatives without coercion or interference.

"(b) Labor is not a commodity. Human rights must be safeguarded. Labor should be exempt from the operation of antitrust laws.

"(c) We recognize that legislative and other investigations have shown the existence of grave abuse to the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes. No injunctions should be granted in labor disputes except upon proof of threatened irreparable injury and after notice and hearing, and the injunction should be confined to those acts which do directly threaten irreparable in ury. The expressed purpose of representatives of capital, labor, and the bar to devise a plan for the elimination of the present evils with respect to injunctions must be supported and legislation designed to accomplish these ends formulated and passed."

Likewise, Mr. President, that is pretty good for a Democratic platform, a rather sound statement of philosophical objective in regard to labor policy; and I also wish to say, to the credit of the Democrats in the Congress at the time when the Norris-LaGuardia bill was passed, that the great majority of them, too, as did the Republicans, kept faith with the pledges in the two platforms from which I have just read excerpts.

Returning now to the House report on the Norris-LaGuardia Act:

The purpose of the bill is to protect the rights of labor in the same manner the Congress intended when it enacted the Clayton Act, October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. L., 738), which act, by reason of its construction and application by the Federal courts, is ineffectual to accomplish the congressional intent.

I have set forth in these two speeches of mine, dealing so largely with the injunction, almost all of my views against the injunction. But they are not my views alone. They are simply the product of many years of careful study of American labor problems, of research into the views of the authorities in this field. I am going to insert now as the last section of my speech on this subject some references to those authorities. I have followed a selective process, because the authorities and references that could be selected are legion. I have already quoted extensively from Greene and Frankfurter. I shall now quote from such writings as Daugherty's Labor Problems in American History; Clark and Simon, the Labor Movement in America; Faulkner and Starr, Labor in America; Yoder, Labor Economics and Labor Problems; and Millis and Montgomery, Organized Labor. There are many others, but I think these authorities will at least round out the case I seek to advance against any tendency to weaken in any respect whatever in connection with the emergency disputes the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

It seems to me that the debate thus far has given insufficient recognition to the significance of the labor injunction. It has given insufficient attention to labor's determined opposition to the use of the injunction as a means of breaking strikes.

In my opinion, it is a mistake to jump to the conclusion that labor's attitude on this question is an emotional one. It is a very practical one, born of sad and bitter experience with arbitrary judges, not familiar, as I said the other day, with the social and economic overtones and undertones inherent in the employer-worker relationships. This attitude of labor led to the Norris-LaGuardia Act, because labor succeeded in convincing the overwhelming majority of the American people that some legislation was necessary, to such a degree that the two major parties, as I have just stated, in their platforms saw fit to include pretty clear reference to the need of labor legislation such as followed in the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Labor is not going to forget those experiences. We can go ahead in the Eighty-first Congress to weaken the Norris-LaGuardia Act, but labor is not going to accept such action. Thus, I plead with all the sincerity it is humanly possible for a man to hold in his breast, that not only my party but the Democratic Party in the Eighty-first Congress reject proposals for a return to the injunctive process, and accept the type of procedure which I have set forth in my amendment. I base my unequivocal and unreserved opposition to legislation, providing for the injunction as a blanket pattern to be used in labor cases, on such statements of authorities as the following. For example, these authors point out that injunctions break strikes. Thus, Millis and Montgomery, on page 631 of their book, say:

For almost a generation and a half, from the 1890's to the early 1930's, it may be said that the power of the courts was invoked to assist in defeating most of the more important strikes—among them, the Pullman strike of 1894, the coal strike of 1919, the shopmen's strike of 1922—and only a smaller proportion of the relatively less important ones.

The authors also state:

The labor view is that the injunction has been a great handicap to the organized-labor movement. Years ago, John Mitchell said, "No weapon has been used with such disastrous effect against trade unions as has the injunction in labor disputes." John Walker, for many years president of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, spoke of it "as the most perfect and modern strike-breaking agency there is on earth." These views have been shared by most labor leaders. The alacrity with which employers have sought restraining orders at the hands of the courts would indicate that there has been much reason for the views expressed.

On page 638 of their book, Millis and Montgomery state:

It should be added that all the above-mentioned injunctions were modified, upon appeal, because in the opinion of the higher courts they transcended the law. The modifications, however, were made after the strikes had been broken.

That is the kernel of this nut. There you have it, Mr. President. The kernel of the argument against injunction is that the injunction breaks the strike, and it is immaterial what an appellate court says in terms of fine-sounding legal phraseology months later. Men suffered as far as their strike was concerned by putting the courts on the side of the employer.

Daugherty, in his book, says:

It was unfair, moreover, to grant a temporary restraining order on the insufficient and biased evidence presented by employers, especially because a preliminary hearing might not be held for several weeks and the strike might be absolutely crushed in the meantime, even though the order was vacated later on.

Clark and Simon, in their book, on page 174, state:

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, employers and courts discovered what has proved to be, to the present, the most effective way yet found to curb union action. This was by use of the injunction, or restraining order.

At page 175, they state:

A restraining order might be issued, employers discovered, without even a hearing in which the union could present its case to the court, and a restraining order is usually enough to break a strike since a strike is either won or lost within a very short time.

Faulkner and Starr, on page 168 of their book, state:

Judge Wilkerson's amazing order (in the railway shopmen's strike of 1922), based on alleged violation of the Transportation Act of 1920 and the Sherman Antitrust Act, has gone down in history as the most far-reaching injunction ever handed down in a labor case. Although generally disregarded by the striking shopmen, it contributed to the collapse of the strike.

Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, testified before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee in 1908 about the effect of the injunction issued in *United States* v. *Workingmen's Amalgamated Council* (54 Fed. 998), and stated:

The issuance of the injunction under the Sherman antitrust law broke the strike.

Even the Supreme Court recognized the effect of injunctions. In the Hitchman coal decision, *Hitchman Coal and*

Coke Co. v. *Mitchell* (245 U. S. 229, 245), Mr. Justice Pitney stated bluntly:

Through the activities of the organizer Hughes they succeeded in shutting it (the mine) down, and it remained closed until a restraining order was allowed by the court, immediately after which it resumed nonunion.

Once the labor injunction received publicity in the 1880's it snowballed, both in the number of injunctions issued and in the increasingly sweeping nature of its terms.

Chief Justice Field, of Massachusetts, said in 1896 that—

The practice of issuing injunctions in cases of this kind is of very recent origin (*Vegelahn* v. *Guntner*, 176 Mass. 93, 100).

Frankfurter and Greene also noted that after the railroad injunction was issued in 1886 "the cases grew in volume like a rolling snowball"—page 21.

They also show how the injunctions increased in breadth to cover all possible activities and that they were directed in "blanket" terms to anyone having the remotest relationship to the union:

A particular controversy between particular parties * * * is made the occasion for a code of conduct governing the whole community (p. 126).

Next, Mr. President, I point out that the injunction became the chief target of organized labor during this period of American history.

I now refer to Professor Witte, of the University of Wisconsin, and I may be pardoned, I hope, for paying a compliment to a great teacher, because it was my privilege to major in labor economics under Professor Witte at the University of Wisconsin. If I may be pardoned for some school pride, I think Professor Witte and his distinguished colleague, Prof. Selig Perlman, must be classed among the very top scholars in America in the field of labor relations. I am very happy to quote Professor Witte today as one of my authorities in support of the argument which I have sought to advance against the injunctive process.

Professor Witte said in 1928:

The phase of the question to which I wish to direct attention is that of the results to society of the restrictions which the antitrust laws (and injunctions based thereon) imposed upon labor combinations. The most apparent of these results is the vast amount of bitterness which these restrictions have aroused within the ranks of labor. Labor is 100 percent united in its condemnation of the courts and in its feeling that the law favors the employer. (18 Am. Lab. Leg. Rev. 315 (1926) The Labor Injunction—A Red Flag by E. E. Witte, chief, Wisconsin Legislative Reference Library.)

Returning, again, to Daugherty's book on this subject, he says, on page 907:

Of all the legal weapons used by employers before the New Deal, organized labor was most bitter over, and, apparently, most fearful of the injunction. This was doubtless due in part to the preventive nature of injunctions; instead of waiting until labor had carried out its program in a given controversy and then suing for damages, an employer could halt the enemy's offensive in mid-air, so to speak, or almost at its inception.

On this same phase of the subject Clark and Simon say, at page 176 of their book:

So serious did the abuse of the injunction become, and so great was the harm done to the unions by injunctions, that organized labor bent all its energy to curb the power of the courts to issue injunctions in labor disputes.

John P. Frey, secretary of the A. F. of L. metal trades department, told a Senate committee in 1918:

We know from our practical experience that if we obey the injunctions which have been issued you would have no trades-union movement, because, to obey those injunctions would have put us out of existence.

The next point I would make, Mr. President, citing authorities in support thereof, is that the injunction caused labor to lose its respect for the courts.

Millis and Montgomery, on page 639 of their book, state:

The first of these [objections to injunctions], and the most important evil connected with the problem, is that the injunction weakened and undermined the courts. Partly because of the bias of a minority of the judges, but chiefly because of an unclear and in many respects an unfair and unduly restrictive labor law, organized labor years ago lost much of its faith in, and became strongly hostile to, the courts. It is not too much to say that respect for law and government has been undermined.

I speak as a lawyer, Mr. President, and, as a lawyer, I say that the reference I have just quoted sets forth what I think is a real danger to government by law in America. Please get me straight on that point. If we pass an injunction law at this session of Congress, the junior Senator from Oregon will insist at all times that that law be enforced, because whenever any group, be it labor or management or any other group, wishes to draw a contest with my Government I shall always be willing to meet that contest by insisting that the law on the books be enforced. My taking that position does not mean that it will affect in the slightest degree either human nature or labor's determination to resist the injunctive process, nor will I or any other Member of the Senate, by taking the position I have just announced—and I know my 95 colleagues will share that view—increase the respect of millions of American workers, who are also fellow citizens, for the court system by placing against them, through legislation, the very weapon they think is most destructive of their rights.

So, I say, Mr. President, now is the time to do our thinking on this subject. Now is the time, before the fact, not after the fact, to realize that if we adopt a pattern of the injunctive process, even in connection with emergency disputes, such legislation will win the undying opposition of organized labor. It will not produce industrial peace and harmony, nor will it aid in advancing peaceful procedures for the settlement of labor disputes.

Why the American employers who are trying to pressure us into the adoption of the injunctive processes in these days cannot see beyond their noses is a complete mystery to me. Would that we could send some of them back to the books to read just a little of the history of the American labor-employer struggle in this country. As certainly as I stand on the floor of the Senate today and say these words, the opposition of labor to the injunctive process will repeat itself, with all the bitterness that goes along with it, if we adopt the injunctive process as a part of the labor legislation we pass in the Eighty-first Congress.

I say, Mr. President, it is not going to make much difference by what sort of limitation we may seek to surround it in the sense of saying, "We are just going to limit it to this body of cases." No matter how much we limit it to certain cases, so long as it is an automatic procedure in respect to those cases, I say we are sowing the seeds again for the extension of the process, because we are laying down a pattern which will create a habit of thinking within the public mind, that because an emergency dispute was ended by an injunction in case A, there should be an extension of the principle also to cases X, Y, and Z, which are less than emergencies, but extremely inconvenient, and very costly to the public in some respects.

Mark my words, that will be the movement in this country, and that movement of course will be resisted by labor, and from that movement there will arise the labor and the social and the economic unrest which form the ingredients of the recipe that produces class strife in any society.

Oh, we were so close, back in 1932, to serious class strife in America, that the writers of that day were writing dissertations on the thesis, Is America going to become a political society splintered by class-conscious limitations? I think the Norris-LaGuardia Act was one of the greatest checks ever adopted by the Congress of the United States in calling a halt to the trend in this country toward class-conscious conflict.

All I can do is make the argument. All I can do, in fairness to my own thinking, is issue the warning, and then hope that the leaders of my party and of the opposition party will take the time, in the next few days, to give the question the study it deserves and not enter upon hasty voting in the Senate on these various proposals. That is all I ask. If they will only study these proposals in light of the history of the labor movement in this country, I am satisfied that studious application on their part to these amendments will result in the adoption of the Morse amendment. The dangers which I have outlined in these remarks are reduced to a minimum in the Morse amendment. My amendment provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall apply to Government seizures unless the Congress after due deliberation and debate is satisfied that on the facts in a particular case the Government should be authorized to seek an injunction and by concurrent resolution decides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall not apply. As I said earlier, I cannot at this time imagine that the parties to a labor dis-

pute would ever permit a set of facts to develop which would cause the Congress of the United States, by concurrent resolution, to make an exception to the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

The next point I desire to make, with citation of authorities, Mr. President, is that the injunctive process caused labor to go into politics. There is nothing wrong about that. Labor ought to be in politics. Every worker in the country, as well as every other citizen, ought to be in politics in the sense of taking an active interest in the political affairs of his Government. But there are politics and politics. There are the politics of good citizenship, free of the bitterness and the selfishness of bloc politics. The injunction forced labor into bloc politics. The injunction had a tendency to create an economic class alignment on the part of labor in the field of American politics, and when that happens what is one of its great dangers? It is the economic issue which is all-prevailing in the thinking of the group that has aligned itself in American politics on a class-conscious basis. It pays little or no attention to the many other issues to which a citizen should give consideration when he interests himself in the political affairs of his government. The only question a class-conscious group asks is, "Where does he stand on this issue? This issue determines whether he gets or does not get our support."

Of course, that has led labor to make some serious mistakes in politics. Every Member of the Senate knows that in the not too distant past men have been removed from the Senate of the United States, at the ballot booths of America, because of their stand on some specific issue, and in particular because of their stand on a labor issue. Without mentioning any names, I merely wish to say that I think one of the outstanding Senators of the United States in the last quarter of a century was defeated for office at the ballot boxes in his State by labor opposition because a certain segment of organized labor did not like his votes on certain labor issues. I spoke to a convention of that organization in another part of the country a few weeks after the defeat of that great Senator, and I said to that convention, as the record will show, "I expect your opposition in 1950, because the Senator whom your organization in another State has defeated in the 1946 election cast identical votes with me in the Senate Labor Committee, and I interpret your action toward him to mean that you are following the same old mistake that labor so frequently has made, that if a man disagrees with you when you are wrong you will nevertheless go out and see if you can defeat him. I want this convention to understand that I am going to vote against labor when I think labor is wrong, just as my colleague did, but I hope you will change your course of action, and recognize that it is a great political mistake to judge a man in the Congress of the United States on the basis of a small number of votes.

"If what you want there are statesmen, not men who will yield to the pressure of any group, even labor, then you ought to judge him on the totality of his record."

They were fair about it. They said, "I think you misunderstood our point of view. The point of view that was expressed by a segment of our organization in another State does not prevail in this State."

My reply was: "I am absolutely right in my point of view, because that is the unfortunate record which labor has made in many political campaigns, of eliminating great statesmen from the Congress because in a vote here and there labor did not like the vote, although 90 or 95 percent of the man's voting record was a record with which labor had to admit they could not disagree."

I have used this example to point out, Mr. President, that when labor goes into bloc politics, into class-conscious politics, we get the type of mistakes as set forth in the example I have used. I am satisfied that the passage of an injunctive pattern in the labor legislation in the Eighty-first Congress will intensify labor political activity by way of a political economic alignment on the part of labor, not an alignment that is based upon a reasoned point of view on all the issues which confront the public welfare.

Thus Faulkner and Starr in their book, at page 117, state:

> More than any other issue it was the use of the injunction in labor disputes that brought the A. F. of L. into the political arena, whether we like it or not.

Of course, some good effects, too, have accrued from labor in politics. It is my personal view that the injunction and the Taft-Hartley law have been the two greatest causes of the development of the present class-conscious political alignment on the part of organized labor in the arena of American politics. We saw its effects in the 1948 campaign. No good can be served by quarreling or quibbling or debating over the interpretation of the results of that campaign. But certainly this general statement must be admitted by all, that the Taft-Hartley law in the 1948 campaign was one of the chief causes—I think the primary cause—that resulted in such a thoroughly organized labor drive in that campaign. My party lost many labor votes which it should have had and which it would have had, I am convinced, had the Taft-Hartley law never been written onto the statute books.

I say to my party today that maybe—maybe—we can win national elections without the support of organized labor. The real question is: Should we? Should we not be a party which proposes a program and has a record which wins the enthusiastic support of all great social and economic groups of our country? I think we should.

We should do much political soul-searching as a party during this debate, Mr. President. We should be very practical about it. We should recognize that we cannot disfranchise American labor. We should take notice now that unless we drastically change the Taft-Hartley law and unless we avoid a weakening of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, organized labor, by an overwhelming vote, will continue its opposition to the Republican Party. Not only would that be unfortunate from the standpoint of the welfare of my country, but I think it would be needless, unnecessary, and short-sighted.

These days are precious so far as the future of my party is concerned, because on this issue, and on one or two others on which we will write our record in the Eighty-first Congress, I think we determine our chances in 1952.

Mr. President, the Norris-LaGuardia Act was one of the results of labor activity in politics. It was one of the good results. I think the Supreme Court summarized the situation in a 1940 decision, in the case of the Milk Wagon Drivers Union against Lake Valley Farm Products (311 U. S. 91, 102), Justice Black speaking for a unanimous court, when the Court said:

> The Norris-LaGuardia Act, passed in 1932, is the culmination of a bitter political, social, and economic controversy extending over half a century. Hostility to "government by injunction" had become the rallying slogan of many and varied groups. Indeed, as early as 1914 Congress had responded to a widespread public demand that the Sherman Act be amended, and had passed the Clayton Act, itself designed to limit the jurisdiction of Federal courts to issue injunctions in cases involving labor disputes. But the proponents of the Norris-La Guardia Act felt that the jurisdictional limitations of the Clayton Act had been largely nullified by judicial decision. Thus, the Senate Judiciary Committee, reporting the Norris-La Guardia Act, said: "That there have been abuses of judicial power in granting injunctions in labor disputes is hardly open to discussion. The use of the injunction in such disputes has been growing by leaps and bounds. * * * For example, approximately 300 were issued in connection with the railway shopmen's strike of 1922."

On this same subject, Mr. President, Clark and Simon say in their book, on page 177:

> After their disappointment with the Clayton Act the unions again took up the fight against the injunction. In 1932 the Norris-La Guardia Anti-Injunction Act was adopted * * * It is a bitter comment on the relationship of labor to the courts that a law which merely gave each party to a labor dispute a chance to present its arguments in support of its action or proposed action could rightly be considered one of the greatest gains labor had made in many years.

Now, Mr. President, just a brief word by way of summary as to what I consider to be the evils inherent in the labor injunction.

First, much of the trouble was caused by the proemployer bias of judges, both Federal and State—as I have shown above.

Second, but even with perfect judges, the nature of the injunction process is such that it cannot work any other way in labor cases.

The court cannot consider the merits of the strike.

This is what Justice—later Chief Justice—Kephart, of Pennsylvania, had to say:

> The questions arising from labor disputes have many times been before the courts for

solution, but because the matter involves so many interdependent details of economic and social life, with the fundamental rights inherent in both contending parties at stake it is obvious that these tribunals should not be the ones to decide them.

Let me say to my good friend who is now presiding over the Senate [Mr. MARTIN] that to that pronouncement of the great Pennsylvania judge, I say, Amen.

Particularly when immediate relief is asked, as it always is in strike cases, the courts must act first, on such preliminary statements of fact as are presented to them, and then consider the whole question in detail later if an appeal is taken. As I have already pointed out in this speech, that usually does not happen, because the injunction succeeds in breaking the strike, and interest in an appeal is lost, particularly with a broken union treasury. Thus in most cases the result is a very unfair one. Yoder, in his book, on pages 568 and 570, says:

No discussions of the legal status of labor organization could ignore the use of labor injunctions.

* * * * *

Some idea of the general willingness of courts to issue injunctions without careful investigation and largely upon the basis of information presented by employers only may be gained in facts disclosed in a study of 118 applications for injunctions to be used in labor disputes that were presented to Federal courts from 1901 to 1928. According to Frankfurter and Greene, 70 of them were ex parte, i. e., granted at once, with no notice to those against whom they were directed and no hearing at which labor's side of the case might be presented.

Because of this unfortunate and bitter experience with the injunctive process, the Norris-LaGuardia Act was supported by many who believed that the injunction was bringing the court system into disrepute. Daugherty, on page 910 of his book, states:

There can be no question that in pure theory injunctions are beautifully prepared to provide justice and equitable relief to employers, workers, and the public. But the way they were handled by American judges in actual practice before (and often after) 1933 greatly embittered labor and led relatively impartial students of the law to point out a number of abuses that should by all means be removed.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I point out that the injunction put the courts on the side of the employer. So long as the injunction was in force the employer had no reason to bargain. The injunction also meant the trial of all issues in contempt proceedings without juries, and usually without a full hearing. The Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed to stop this perversion of standard court procedure. That was brilliantly summarized in the quotation which I have already read, from Greene and Frankfurter, on pages 200 and 201.

It might reasonably be argued that all I have said against the injunctive process applies to its use in nonnational emergency dispute cases. Let us see, Mr. President. I support the contention that the injunction is no better in national-emergency cases, and for these reasons:

First, it still carries the odium of the labor injunction.

Second, it still means that the courts must act without considering all the facts.

Third, I think it means that the courts are bound to uphold the President's finding that the strike threatens the national welfare. It is not reasonable to expect, in very many instances, that when the President of the United States makes such a finding the courts are going to reach a contrary conclusion. They are going to give him the benefit of the doubt. What I fear is that the court injunction will be an automatic thing, with language which says, to paraphrase the words of the Supreme Court as cited by my good friend from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] the other day, that the Court may grant such an injunction when, on due deliberation and investigation, it is satisfied that a crippling paralysis is likely to overtake the country. I think it is to be expected, regardless of how the provision may be couched in legal theory, that in practice the process will be automatic in national-emergency disputes unless we have the type of safeguard provided in the Morse amendment, placing upon Congress the affirmative duty, by concurrent resolution, of specifically exempting the case from the Norris-LaGuardia Act. This is the forum in which the question should be determined, because it involves a fundamental question of public policy relating to the social and economic life of the country.

I say further that the injunction procedure in emergency disputes is clearly not an issue on which the courts can very effectively conduct a trial and weigh evidence. It still means putting the entire industrial operation really under the supervision of the courts. It means that every act of the union and of the employees will be suspect. Any misstep on their part may be brought before the court. Criminal sanctions may be imposed without jury trial. The facts may be determined on the basis of affidavits, rather than testimony. The issue comes before the court, which must feel that its first duty is to protect the dignity and integrity of the judicial system. It gives the workers an unacceptable choice of either going to jail for contempt or working, under the direction of the injunction, for the profit of the private employer so long as the injunction applies.

Mr. President, that is where my great fear of bitter, determined labor opposition arises. As I stated the other day, if we are going to deal with difficult hypothetical fact situations in this debate we cannot ignore the hypothetical so frequently discussed in our hearings on this bill. I wonder what we would do if 150,000 workers said "We will go to jail."

Thus, I say that the injunctive process puts the Government on the side of the employer. The employer continues to operate. I am speaking now of the injunctive process, and not the seizure process.

It must be remembered that the national emergency provision applies even if the strike is provoked by illegal conduct on the part of the employer. He can continue his illegal conduct, while his employees are forced to remain at work, and the union thereby loses its sole bargaining power. It is absurd, I think, to say that the injunctive process applies an even-handed justice to labor disputes.

Moreover, I argue that in the last analysis the injunction really solves nothing. If it helps toward settlement, it is only because it weakens or destroys one side to the dispute. It does not decide the merits of the dispute. If it does not achieve a settlement on the merits, then it achieves only delay, exasperation, and stultification of collective bargaining. That has been the experience under the Taft-Hartley law. I believe that the injunctions have done great harm under the Taft-Hartley law. Thus Theodore W. Kheel, who, according to the newspapers, is the newly appointed "czar" of the New York transportation industry, testified as follows, before a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee, as director of labor relations of New York City, on March 18, 1949:

I might say that in the early part of 1946 we had a tugboat strike in New York City, and, I believe, that of all the strikes that New York City has had, that was probably the worst. We did not fully realize how important our tugboats were until the tugboat strike occurred. The island of Manhattan is dependent upon oil and food which must be brought in by tugboats" (pp. 1120–1121).

But, Mr. President, the injunctive process in a case such as that cannot possibly settle the case on its merits. The economic facts about the industry and about the demands of the union as to wages, hours, and conditions of employment must be ascertained.

In January 1949 another tie-up was threatened in New York City. The question arose whether this was a national emergency in which an injunction could issue. The strike deadline was December 31, 1948. If an injunction issued, the deadline would be postponed to March 20. Mr. Kheel said (p. 1121):

Because of the uncertainty as to whether or not they would be enjoined in the event of a failure to agree, there was absolutely no collective bargaining taking place whatsoever, for the reason that if there was the possibility of an injunction then they were not going to bargain against the December 31 deadline, but March 20.

In other words, in that case the talk about an injunction threatened good-faith collective bargaining.

Mr. Kheel further said:

The union would make no concessions and the employer would make no concessions, if the deadline was going to be December 31, and they would be able to bargain in the light of that deadline. That is the way the employers acted, and the way the unions acted. They were not going to make concessions before the expiration of their contract, as they would have roughly 80 days after the contract expired. So we had a state of great uncertainty with no collective bargaining taking place.

We were able, at that time, to communicate with the Federal authorities, and ask them whether they thought an injunction was likely, and without committing themselves—obviously, as they could not—they did indicate that an injunction was not likely because of the local character of the dispute, and we were able to pass that on to the parties, and that made it possible for the wheels of collective bargaining to begin to revolve. And it made it possible for us to work out a settlement. As a matter of

fact, we got a postponement of a week or two at the request of the mayor, and some time around the 10th of January we worked out a settlement of that dispute, which probably still would be lingering with us right now if the injunction had been issued, and the deadline had been postponed from January 1 to March 20.

Mr. President, it seems to me that Mr. Kheel's testimony not only points out very clearly the argument that in national emergency disputes the injunction may prove to be an impediment to good-faith collective bargaining, but also shows that two additional disadvantages are produced by cooling-off periods enforced by the use of injunctions. They introduce a new factor which has to be bargained about, namely, retroactivity; and in the second place, they disturb the seasonal pattern of negotiations.

Mr. Kheel further testified, as shown at page 1123 of the hearings:

I would like to also bring to your attention the fact the 80-day "cooling off" period creates additional problems. It creates the problem of retroactivity, and that becomes a new issue. That did not exist before the injunction was issued. When the contract expires, if an agreement is reached at the time of the expiration of the contract, presumably it takes effect on that date. When the United States Government comes along and enjoins a strike for 80 days it is only fair to expect that the employees will try to get any adjustment subsequently agreed upon—subsequent to the date upon which their contract expires.

* * * * *

So I say there is a new issue: The 80-day injunction creates a new issue that you do not have without the 80-day injunction.

There is another problem it creates in most cases, and that is that particular contract termination dates have some historical significances in the light of the bargaining of the parties. It may come at a time when the business of the employer is in the slow season, and whatever the reason for the particular time, the fact is that the parties have bargained, and you come along with an 80-day injunction, and you can do great harm to employers, and you can do great harm to unions, in that respect because you can alter their basic bargaining positions. You can take an employer from the slow season into his very busy season, where a strike would be absolutely fatal to him; and therefore the union's position is strengthened that much. Or, it may work in exactly the reverse.

Mr. President, in final summary of my position, I wish to say that I agree with such an authority in the field of labor relations as Ted Kheel, of New York. In spite of the opposing view held as to their standing as authorities, I also agree with such men as Will Davis, Will Leiserson, and Nathan Feinsinger, because they have been tested for impartiality in the fires of some of the hottest labor disputes in this country in the past dozen or more years. I have worked closely with them in connection with various Government labor boards, and I think the Senate of the United States can well afford to read very carefully the testimony of such men as Kheel, Davis, Leiserson, and Feinsinger. Really, Mr. President, their record needs no defense by me. I wish to say for this RECORD, however, that I know that American industry contains many industrial statesmen who, in behalf of management, will always be happy to accept the arbitration or mediation services of these leaders in the field of labor relations. I join the Senator from Ohio in his favorable opinion of Mr. Ching, the head of the Mediation and Conciliation Service; and I put Mr. Ching in the same class with Davis, Feinsinger, Leiserson, and Kheel, for I am satisfied that his philosophy for the peaceful settlement of labor disputes is almost identical with the philosophy of the other authorities I have mentioned.

Thus in the course of these remarks today, Mr. President, I have tried to lead the Senate to the writings and the views of experts in this field, because I hold fast to the view that one of our tasks of statesmanship is, after all, to base our action upon the views of experts and authorities who are better qualified to speak on these subjects than are we; and if Members of the Senate of the United States are willing to go to the books, as I have sought to lead them to the books this afternoon in this very dry lecture on labor problems, and study the findings and views of the authorities, then I am satisfied that there should be a majority vote in the Senate for the Morse amendment, an overwhelming vote against the Douglas amendment, and an equally overwhelming vote against a return to the injunctive process as proposed and recommended by my good friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, in order that I may make a brief announcement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may yield to the Senator from Illinois, to permit an announcement to be made.

Mr. MORSE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to inform the Senate that we probably shall continue until 6:30 or 7 o'clock this evening, before we take a recess until tomorrow. Undoubtedly we shall have a session on Saturday of this week. I have talked to a number of Senators who feel that we should have a session on Saturday in order to make a little more progress, if we can, on the labor bill and other bills which have a dead line next week. There are a number of appropriation bills and conference reports which will have to be considered. It may be necessary to hold some night sessions next week. I merely make this announcement at this time in order that Senators may be informed.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor. Without objection, he may yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to ask a question.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator now speaking read in the press a statement that it is probable that the Senate leadership will arrange for a recess of the Senate from Thursday before the Fourth of July until Tuesday after the Fourth of July. Is that contemplated?

Mr. LUCAS. I made that statement yesterday on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. I beg pardon; I did not hear it.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the plan, I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire. We shall have to move out of this Chamber by July 1, in order that the contractors may proceed under the contract to reinforce the roof; and it will take a few days to move everything out of this Chamber.

So the proposed recess of several days will not only give Senators an opportunity to have 3 or 4 days during the Fourth of July period, but, more important than that, it will give the employees of the office of the Sergeant at Arms an opportunity to move the furnishings and fixtures from this Chamber and get everything ready in the old Supreme Court room, so that we may meet there.

Mr. TOBEY. Is the distinguished Senator, the majority leader, optimistic enough to believe and have faith in the expectation and hope that when, as, and if we move into the old Senate Chamber, which later was used by the Supreme Court, before it moved into its new building, the business of the Senate will be more expeditiously proceeded with and the speeches of Senators will be shortened sufficiently so that we shall move forward with more acceleration to the glorious adjournment to which all of us are looking forward?

Mr. LUCAS. I had a slight colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Oregon the other day along that particular line. Of course, it is my hope that wherever the Senate might meet, or even if it were to continue to meet in this Chamber, we could expedite the business of the Senate to the end that we might have an early adjournment. I cannot prophesy when the adjournment will occur. I may say that at the rate of speed at which we are moving at the present time, we may be here for a long time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall continue to yield for these interruptions. I yield further to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that Daniel Webster sometimes spoke in the old Senate Chamber for 3 days at a time. So I do not think we can hope for any shortening of the speeches simply because we shall be meeting in the old Senate Chamber.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on that point, I promise and guarantee that this successor of Daniel Webster in the Senate, from New Hampshire, will be very brief in his remarks. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire will do everything in his power to persuade the Members of the Senate on his side of the aisle to be as brief as possible in their remarks.

Mr. TOBEY. When I referred to the analogy of Daniel Webster as a predecessor of mine in these Halls, I had no reference to a comparison of virtue or oratorical ability, but merely that I was one of his successors in these modern days.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is a worthy successor of Daniel Webster,

and says much more in a short time than Daniel Webster could say in a long time.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Now that we have finally disposed of Daniel Webster, I should like to ask the majority leader a question. Does he believe that in the next day or two there will be no legislation displacing the labor bill, even temporarily? Of course I know the majority leader cannot say when we shall reach a vote on that measure or any other measure; but regardless of whether we vote or do not vote today on amendments to the labor bill, does the Senator from Illinois believe we shall continue with the consideration of the labor bill until next Monday, possibly; or are there other bills which will come before us between now and then?

I ask that question for the reason that I have already consulted with the majority leader, and I know there are several Senators who, I am satisfied, would like to vote today on various of the amendments to the labor bill. However, they are somewhat confused as to what might happen on Thursday or Friday or during the contemplated Saturday session this week.

So I inquire whether it is the idea that we shall continue with the consideration of the labor bill throughout this week, or is it contemplated that other measures will displace it?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, obviously I cannot answer the Senator categorically as to when we may vote on any amendment. For some time I have been hoping we might vote very soon on the Douglas-Aiken amendment, which is the pending question. At the same time, I recognize that all Senators have a right to speak as long as they desire to speak upon any amendment or even upon any extraneous matter.

I hope we may soon reach a vote on the Douglas amendment and the Ives amendment. I do not know what the parliamentary situation will be thereafter; but so far as Thursday and Friday of this week are concerned, I do not see why we cannot go right ahead during those days with the consideration of the labor bill.

I know what the Senator from Nebraska has in mind, and I wish to accommodate the two distinguished Senators from Massachusetts or any other Senators who are desirous of leaving the Capital on important business. However, I have discovered that the moment one tries to accommodate two Senators, the next day we are likely to find that two other Senators are desirous of leaving and wish to be accommodated, and of course it is rather difficult to accommodate everyone.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my question was not in reference to the matter of accommodation, although I deeply appreciate what has been stated by the majority leader in that respect. However, my question is this: When, as, and if the Douglas amendment or the Ives amendment, or both, are voted upon, does the majority leader believe there will then be any votes on the pending labor legislation before next Monday, or will there be other proposed legislation which will be brought up, so that possibly the votes on various amendments to the labor bill will not come up, anyway?

Mr. LUCAS. It may be that appropriation bills or conference reports will be coming before us in the meantime; but primarily it is my intention to have the Senate stay on the labor bill. It is a certainty that we shall do so unless something in the nature of a real emergency matter which has a dead line or an appropriation bill or some other measure relative to a law which will terminate on June 30 is ready to be acted upon by us.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to state that a while ago I spoke to the distinguished Senator from Oregon about my intention to bring up the conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, because there is quite a difference between the conferees on the part of the Senate and the conferees on the part of the House in respect to additional internal-revenue collectors. As soon as the Senator from Oregon finishes his speech, I should like to bring up that very important matter. It will take about half an hour.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that while I was out of the Chamber, the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] stated that Daniel Webster was a Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Oh, no; the Senator is in error.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire did not say anything like that, because of course Daniel Webster was a Senator from Massachusetts, and was one of the crowning glories of our great State in his era.

As we remember, he said:

> I shall enter on no encomium upon Massachusetts; she needs none. There she is. Behold her, and judge for yourselves.

Mr. TOBEY. Daniel Webster also said, as we remember:

> Other misfortunes may be born and their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation will renew it. If it exhausts our Treasury, future industry will replenish it. If it desolates and lays waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation they will grow green again, and ripen under future harvests.
>
> But who can reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who can rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who can frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again.

That was Webster at his best. We ought to take that as a pattern for our thoughts today. But as to Daniel Webster, he was born in New Hampshire, he graduated from Dartmouth College and he practiced law in New Hampshire. He acquired from the Old Granite State all the vim, vigor, vitality, and inspiration that carried him all the way from Massachusetts to the Senate Chamber.

Mr. LODGE. The point I make is that he was a Senator from Massachusetts, and it was as a Senator from Massachusetts and as a citizen of Massachusetts that he did his great work.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may ask another question? I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yet get the answer of the majority leader about Saturday. I am very sincere about it. Here is a conference report that is coming up. I am wondering whether, after we shall have devoted our efforts to have the votes the majority leader has mentioned today, other matters might be brought up, so that we would not even arrive at a vote on the amendments. Of course I understand the majority leader cannot state on the floor of the Senate when a vote is going to be taken, but in mapping out the program, does the Senator feel that there will be a Saturday session?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I made that announcement a moment ago. I feel that we are justified in holding a Saturday session. I dislike to do it, but in view of the fact that we have a dead line on appropriations and in view of the fact that we are a little behind as I see it upon the labor bill, I believe that it is necessary that we hold a Saturday session with a view to trying to accomplish a few things.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely want to make one concluding observation. Of course, if we are at that time on the labor bill, and could obtain votes on the amendments, I think we ought to stay here. That bill is the unfinished business before the Senate, and we ought to vote it up or down. But there are privileged motions, such as conference reports; and it was my idea that if after voting on the Douglas amendment and upon the Ives amendment, if those other matters could come up, then the whole situation would be alleviated until at least next Monday. But I am perfectly agreeable to proceeding in any way the majority leader suggests.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot anticipate what is going to happen. Of course, a conference report is privileged. It may only take a few minutes to approve a conference report; and we may find tomorrow that there might not be any other measure to consider but the labor bill. The moment we finish a conference report or any other matter that has a dead line, we automatically return to the labor bill, and we are going to stay on the labor bill until it is finished. I think that is about all I can say. I want to thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding in order that I might make these announcements.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have a unanimous consent agreement that all this interruption, interesting as it was, shall appear at the end of my remarks rather than in the body of my remarks?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to be absent for the remainder of the afternoon. I am scheduled to speak at graduation exercises in Middletown at 8 o'clock tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have had prepared a comparative study——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to obtain the floor in my own right, because I have promised to ask for a quorum call in connection with a privileged matter, but I do not want to interfere, if the Chair has recognized the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has already recognized the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I may ask, what is the Senator's purpose?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There is a privileged matter having to do with a conference report which the leaders have arranged to bring up, and I promised to ask for a quorum call as soon as the Senator from Oregon completed his remarks. I arose for two purposes; first, to ask for a quorum call, and then to have inserted in the RECORD, at this place, a comparative study which I have asked to be made of the five propositions which are before us. My part of it is not sufficiently privileged.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? It was understood this morning, I thought, that after the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had completed his speech——

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, my remarks will take only about half an hour.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I must insist on bringing up the conference report on the Treasury and Post Office bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. President, for the past 2 weeks now I have devoted myself intensely to a careful study of the great issue presently before the Senate of the United States. I have followed closely the debates, and may I say they have been eloquent and conducted on a level which has done credit to our free processes of Government. I have read within the limitations which time has imposed such relevant material as I could lay my hands on, including thousands of letters from my own constituents—all with the result, Mr. President, that I am convinced that we are now treating with the most important domestic issue which is to come before the Eighty-first Congress; indeed, history may prove it to be the most important of all the issues to which this Congress will give consideration.

So without hesitation, I arise to bespeak my views in the sincere hope that those views will contribute some small mite to the solution of this grave problem of labor-management relations. To remain silent at such a time would according to my own standards, be an avoidance of clear duty; and, Mr. President, this is particularly so, it seems to me, in respect to the pending amendments dealing with emergency disputes which may imperil or threaten to imperil the national health and safety.

Before I undertake to treat with the amendments immediately before us, I should like to digress for a moment or two to comment upon some of the remarks which have preceded my own; and I do this objectively; indeed, I do it because I think it is high time that we get to a solution of this controversy on a basis which truly recognizes labor-management relations as a four-party relationship, each party having its particular share and responsibility to the whole. Certainly under our system of government and our way of life the first and major party to this relationship is the people of America—all of the people. It is for them that our Government exists. It is for the welfare of the people that all of our great institutions in government and under government have been established. So then, as the other parties to this relationship seek to attain their respective objectives, they should and must guide their thoughts and actions from the beginning on those three significant and vital first words of our great charter of government, "We, the people."

In their order, the other parties to this important relationship are labor, industry, and last, but not least, the Government itself. In treating with their problems and differences, both labor and industry should try to remember that they are or should be truly partners and if, between themselves, they cannot settle their differences amicably and peacefully, then their recourse is to the Government, not as an advocate of one against the other, not as a partisan, but as the referee who has been designated by the people through their duly elected representatives to see to it that justice and equity are done in all cases with a minimum of injury or damage to any of the parties involved.

We are all deeply concerned with the abuse of power and undermining influences. Regardless of their origin, we are all determined to safeguard and protect each other against abuses, even though in so doing we may incur a personal loss. The unselfish sacrifices in the late war furnish eloquent testimony of this fact, and there are countless thousands of other examples in every walk of life.

This, Mr. President, is no time to elaborate on the sins of the past for mass appeal. The abuses on the side of industry as well as those on the side of labor are known to us all. Let us be fair to both sides and charge their sins to the growing pains which always accompany tremendous expansion. While we would not return to the past, let us utilize its experiences as beacon lights to guide us, but, for the purpose of this debate, let us not cloud the record by further exaggeration on either side.

Let us remember the admonition of Mr. Webster in his reply to Hayne and take our true bearings and from here on in hold to the course without recourse to histrionic deflections.

Now, Mr. President, I proceed to the several proposals under immediate consideration. They are, I believe, five in number. As the junior Senator from New York indicated:

> These proposals range all the way from that which is in the Thomas bill, which seems to me to contain no more than a slight assurance of being sufficient to cope with the problem in question, to the more extreme provisions in the Taft amendment which would authorize seizure or the injunction, or both. * * * Speaking of the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Utah, I feel that the plan in his bill is excellent insofar as it goes, but it does not go far enough. His plan calls for a declaration of national emergency by the President, the appointment of an emergency board, and an over-all cooling-off period of 30 days, and then virtually drops the matter there, regardless of the seriousness of the situation. It follows, in general, the emergency provisions in the National Railway Labor Act which, to be sure, have worked for the most part very effectively over the years, but which can, nevertheless, be improved upon, as experience would indicate.

For sake of brevity, which I rather suspect that this record will lack before the debates are concluded, I shall try to avoid repetition, but, like the Senator from New York, I want it clearly understood that I do not favor the injunction as an appropriate and just means by which to attain the objectives which we seek in this instance.

Mr. President, I come from a State which was once the citadel of injunctions, and despite my high regard for the now defunct court of chancery of New Jersey and its great contributions to our concepts of equity and justice, it was for a time, I must concede, one of the worst enemies of collective bargaining against which labor has ever been pitted. Not that it lacked integrity, but it was truly reactionary in its findings. Thus, it is with some pride, Mr. President, that I state that I joined, as a member of the Senate of New Jersey, in ending its powers in this respect. I will not burden the Senate with the history of the fight to end injunctions on labor disputes in New Jersey. Suffice it to say that chapter 15 of the Laws of New Jersey of 1941 signed the death knell of this process in my own State, and I had hoped that I was through with that for all time to come. Now I find myself confronted with the possible dilemma of supporting a principle, at the national level, which I have already rejected as a solution of labor disputes.

Mr. President, it is quite clear to me at this point that I cannot support the proposal of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. His plan follows, it is true, the emergency provision in the National Railway Labor Act, and, thanks largely to the patriotic attitude of our railway workers, that act has worked well; but we may not always have, in our national emergencies, the truly patriotic reaction of our railroad brotherhoods. So it may be wise, as the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri has suggested, to give some thought to a possible improvement of that act in respect to national emergencies.

Now, Mr. President, we have before us, in addition to the Thomas proposal which calls for a declaration of national emergency by the President, the appointment of an emergency board and and over-all cooling-off period of 30 days, other proposals calling for plant seizure and injunction.

On the subject of the injunction, Mr. President, I have already expressed my views in no uncertain terms. On the proposals for plant seizure I instinctively rebel, first, because it would be a clear way to statism in the truest sense of the word, and, second, it has, under our system of private enterprise, no place whatsoever in our scheme of things, unless it is justified by the circumstance in any given case under the peril of a national emergency, and then it should be authorized only by the Congress of the United States to meet that special emergency.

This is the very root of the perfecting amendment of the junior Senator from New York. I will not repeat, Mr. President, the procedural devices of that amendment because they have been so clearly outlined by their able draftsman. Suffice it for me to say that the Ives amendment offers such a clear way out of sure and certain conflict, that I cannot comprehend why it has not been seized upon by all as the real solution to the most controversial phase of the issue before us. I have not been impressed, Mr. President, by the very eloquent and practical arguments that the Congress is too cumbersome, too unwieldy, to act in a national emergency; indeed, there has never been a national emergency in peace or in war where the Congress of the United States has failed fully to meet its obligations to the people and with ultimate credit to those who carefully designed its purpose, namely, that of establishing the rules by which our lives shall be governed.

Mr. President, it is to the credit of the Congress that it always acts in great emergencies with a speed and exactness of purpose that sometimes bewilders students of government.

No, Mr. President; I cannot concede that in a national emergency, the mind of one man, whether he be the Chief Executive or a judge, is better than the combined thinking of 531 men who, under a carefully conceived system of checks and balances, have been chosen to represent the people of this Nation on all matters affecting our health and safety. We shall all rue that day, Mr. President, when we cannot trust the greatest legislative body in the world to meet squarely and promptly its obligation to its founders and to the 148,000,000 souls for whom it exists.

Mr. President, I was deeply concerned about this issue until the presentation of the Ives amendment. There I found the answer and felt immediate relief. To me it was just this simple. Suppose, I asked myself, that any of the other proposals were in effect and we were confronted by a national emergency of a scope hitherto unknown. Suppose that none of the procedural devices proved effective in the first few days of the emergency. Short of revolution, what would happen? Why, Mr. President, the President would exercise his inherent powers, meet those immediate problems which are within his constitutional authority, and call the Congress to meet the over-all emergency. The long and short of the whole discussion presently before us, Mr. President, is that the determination of any great issue must ultimately come back to the Congress for settlement and solution. Why not alert the Congress now on this issue to a responsibility which apparently it does not clearly realize? One day it may be called upon to forego its traditions of unlimited debate and the niceties of parliamentary procedure which seem so important to our great and sometimes ponderous dignity. One day it must act in unison with only the thought of the people and their welfare in mind, with the hope of preserving our precious heritages and our free institutions, with the common resolve that the Congress of the United States shall preserve our way of life at any cost, even to the point of yielding its precious rules in order to maintain a United States of America free from disintegration and internal strife.

Because the Congress will in any case be the final arbiter of this grave question of national emergencies, let us assume the responsibility now and support the Ives amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have had prepared a comparative study of the various proposals which are before us, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a part of my remarks.

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

Comparison of Senate amendments of national emergency provisions

National emergency procedures	Taft-Hartley Act	Thomas bill	Douglas amendment	Taft amendment	Ives amendment	Morse amendment
Application of procedures.	Work stoppage imperiling national health or safety.	Work stoppage threatening to result in national emergency.	Same as Thomas bill.	Same as Taft-Hartley Act.	Same as Thomas bill.	Same as Taft-Hartley Act.
Proclamation		Declare emergency—call on parties resume work.	do	Declare emergency—urge parties resume work.	do	Same as Taft amendment.
Maximum cooling-off period.	80-day waiting period after Board's report.	30 days after Presidential proclamation.	90 days after appointment of Emergency Board.	60 days after Presidential proclamation.	30 days after Presidential proclamation.	90 days after appointment of Emergency Board.
Emergency Board	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Board makes recommendations.	No	do	do	do	do	Do.
Maximum time for Board report.	President to prescribe.	25 days	30 days	30 days	30 days	30 days.
Injunction	Expressly permitted—80 days.	No provision	No provision. Implied through seizure provision.	Expressly permitted—60 days.	No provision	Expressly prohibited except by concurrent resolution of Congress.
Seizure	Silent	Silent	President authorized to seize.	President may ask court for authority to seize.	Silent	President may seize if he so recommends to Congress and Congress does not take action within 10 days.
Permissive intermediate report to Congress.	No provision	No provision	No provision	At any time after proclamation with recommendations.	Same as Taft	Same as Taft.
Mandatory intermediate report to Congress.	do	do	do	If strike continues after Board's report.	If strike continues after proclamation.	If strike continues after proclamation.
Employment conditions during cooling-off period.	do	Those prior to dispute.	Same as Thomas bill	Seizing agency may not alter.	No provision	Seizing agency may put into effect recommendations of Emergency Board or conditions determined by Congress.
Mediation during cooling-off period.	Conciliation Service to assist parties.	Emergency Board and Conciliation Service seek to get parties to settle.	Same as Thomas bill and parties must continue collective bargaining.	Emergency Board and Conciliation Service seek to get parties to settle.	Same as Taft except for seizure provision.	Same as Taft.
Final report to Congress.	Mandatory after discharge of injunction.	No provision	No provision	Mandatory after dispute has been settled.	Same as Taft	Do.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Martin
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Millikin
Bridges	Holland	Morse
Butler	Humphrey	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Murray
Cain	Ives	Myers
Capehart	Jenner	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Downey	Knowland	Taft
Eastland	Langer	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Long	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Lucas	Thye
George	McCarran	Tobey
Gillette	McCarthy	Tydings
Graham	McClellan	Vandenberg
Green	McFarland	Watkins
Gurney	McKellar	Wherry
Hayden	McMahon	Young
Hendrickson	Malone	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for himself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the so-called Thomas substitute.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit to the desk the conference report on House bill 3083, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill for 1950, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3083) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, 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 13, 14, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 39, 40, 41, and 50, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,020,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,150,000"; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,660,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$76,250,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$39,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,255,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,490,000"; 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 "$907,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$302,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$440,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$98,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$556,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,780,000"; 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 "$629,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$33,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,300,000"; 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 "$393,000,000"; 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 "$31,000,000"; 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 "$128,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$650,000"; 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 "$11,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,200,000"; 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 "$51,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$52,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,205,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,775,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the word proposed by said amendment insert "forty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, and 49.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
CARL HAYDEN,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
GUY CORDON,
CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3083, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 15, 1949.

Resolved, That the House agrees to conference report to the bill (H. R. 3083) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 49, and concur therein;

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5, 6, and 7 to said bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments numbered 5, 6 and 7. They relate to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and provide an increase of $12,268,000 over the House allowance of $220,500,000 for operating expenses; also provide for removal of the over-all personal service limitation in order to allow more flexibility in the employment of additional personnel and procurement of equipment. The House has insisted on its disagreement to these three amendments, contending, in the main, that there appears no sound justification for the additional employment of some 5,500 enforcement officers in the field and that the House allowance of some 1,500 additional positions is sufficient in light of the possibility of diminishing returns in fiscal year 1950.

The House further contends that great doubt exists as to the absorption into the service of the 5,500 additional front-line officers proposed by the Senate. In this connection, it must be remembered that the Senate's recommendation was that the funds for these additional employees provided for only 6 months' employment in the fiscal year 1950 and not for the full fiscal year. On that basis Treasury officials stated the 5,500 positions could be easily filled and substantial additional collections of many millions of dollars derived from work of these additional enforcement officers by July 1. In fact, it was testified that the additional enforcement personnel would collect annually, beginning fiscal year 1951, at least $425,000,000 additional revenue.

There is no evidence of diminishing returns. The record clearly shows that for the first 3 months of 1949—January, February and March—there were filed 44,565,422 returns as against 40,891,370 for the same period in 1948. This is about a 10 percent increase in the current year over the prior year. The present front-line enforcement officers averaged per person additional revenue of $52,708 for 1946, $73,805 for 1947, $89,271 for 1948, and for the first 7 months of fiscal year 1949, $50,066.

Mr. President, it was the sense of the Senate conferees, it was the sense of the members of the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which had charge of the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, and of the full Appropriations Committee, that with these additional front-line officers under the Bureau of Internal Revenue perhaps there might be collected for the United States about $1,000,000,000 in taxes which are due, and have been due for the past few years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has moved that the Senate further insist upon its amendments numbered 5, 6, and 7, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on this matter. I believe Members of the Senate know that, generally speaking, I strongly favor economy in government. But I think it is false economy to deny the Treasury Department or the Bureau of Internal Revenue these additional tax agents, these additional field men, to collect taxes which are due and unpaid. I am confident that an adequate force in the Bureau would result in increasing the revenues of the Government during the next several years, but particularly the years immediately ahead of us, by one-half billion dollars.

I do not favor the theory that a tax agent can pay his own way. That seems to me to be highly offensive, when it is analyzed. But I do believe that if we have an adequate force, returns of taxpayers can be adequately and carefully checked, with the resulting saving to the Treasury of many million dollars.

Mr. President, there is also another angle to the matter which is often overlooked. With an adequate force it will be found that many assessments are rather arbitrarily imposed, because with the running of the statute, as time elapses the agents are too often tempted to impose or to make an assessment of additional taxes with very inadequate bases for the assessment. That would not happen if an adequate force were available. If an opportunity were afforded to have the returns examined by competent men, arbitrary assessments would actually diminish numerically, but there would be an increase in collection of taxes which would very greatly aid and assist the Treasury at this time.

Then upon the basis of highest public morality, one man should not be required to pay a just tax, and to be subjected to a just tax under the laws of his country, while another man escapes, and escapes too often because he knows that the law-enforcement agencies of his Government have an inadequate force with which to audit the returns, and to make proper levies or assessments in cases where such levies should be made.

So I very much hope that the Senate will agree to the motion made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of Committee on Appropriations, in order that the House may have the opportunity to grant this very reasonable increase in appropriations to take care of a very necessary and a very proper and a much-needed service at this time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the distiguished chairman of the Finance Committee has just said. I believe that at the present time the staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue devoted to the task of examining returns and reporting on them is grossly inadequate. I think that the odds in favor of the law violator are entirely too long in his favor as a result of that situation. I do not know how we can increase our revenues more readily than by increasing that staff. Therefore, I, too, express the earnest hope that the conferees will stand by the Senate version of the bill in that respect.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in supporting the proposed increase in the number of auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It is very rarely that I rise to advocate an increased appropriation; but I believe that in this instance I am doing so in the interest of economy, because I am convinced that if we appoint a larger number of auditors we shall certainly get a greatly increased revenue.

As I understand, the Bureau of Internal Revenue asked for 10,000 additional auditors, and it has been given 1,500. The budget made provision for 7,000.

I have made some investigation of this question as a member of the Finance Committee. I am convinced that there

are not a sufficient number of auditors to audit the income-tax returns, and that the appointment of the additional number requested would bring revenue to the Government many times in excess of the cost. I therefore favor the position taken by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one of the members of the minority party who sat as a member of the subcommittee which considered this subject, I hope the Senate will stand by its position. I join with other Senators who have spoken on this question, for two reasons.

First, in my opinion it will bring in greatly increased revenue to the Government.

Second, it is fair. It is fair to more people. It is not fair when people can escape taxes by refusing to sign the proper returns. It is not fair to the people who do sign the proper returns. I am confident that with 7,000 additional auditors, who must be trained before they can be put into service, the Treasury will receive greater revenue, and tax collections will be fairer to all taxpayers.

I join with the Senator from South Carolina and other Senators in the hope that the Senate will stand by its position.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I associate myself with the Senator from Massachusetts and the distinguished Senator from Virginia, whom I have just heard address the Senate relative to this appropriation. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I believe that if we attempt to justify the various projects which come before us, this is one which certainly should be approved.

I join in stating that I feel the Senate ought to stand by its position; and I hope it will stand long enough so that the conference will accept this increase.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with my colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee in urging that the chairman be upheld in his contention that more auditors should be provided. All the arguments have been advanced. In the name of justice and fair dealing with the taxpayers, I think we must be able to audit the tax returns on a fair basis.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am a member of the subcommittee which handled the Treasury appropriation bill, and I heard all the evidence presented on this particular issue. I was thoroughly convinced that it would be a good investment to increase the number of enforcement agents of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. We were told what a relatively small number of returns they had been able to examine. I shall not indicate how small the number was. We were convinced that payment of a large amount of taxes was being evaded, and that the taxes could be collected if a more adequate force were available.

So I hope the Senate will support the action of the Appropriations Committee and the vote which the Senate has already cast in behalf of this provision, and instruct the Senate conferees to insist upon our position, or at least upon a more reasonable compromise of the differences than has been heretofore accomplished.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I agree with the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MAYBANK] on this subject. The Senate knows that I am for economy everywhere it can be practiced. This is about the only instance I know of in connection with appropriation bills in which I see any excuse whatsoever for putting on additional help. In practically every other department or bureau I think appropriations can be cut and the department operated with efficiency. But I believe that in fairness to those who honestly pay their taxes the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be fortified with sufficient assistance to do an adequate job. That is the position of the subcommittee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Senate; and I think that position should be sustained.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, having served on the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and also on the free conference committee, and having heard the testimony which was given before the subcommittee, I am thoroughly convinced that the proposed increase in the number of internal-revenue collectors will add materially to the amount of revenue collected.

I for one believe that this would equalize the payment of taxes. If we let some evade paying their just amount of taxes, someone else will have to pay that amount. It will be the man who is now paying. It will not be the man who is now evading taxation, for probably he will try to evade in the future also.

For that reason I believe that this additional appropriation would result in bringing many millions of dollars of additional revenue in the Treasury of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am happy that we are to have the yeas and nays on this motion. As the ranking member of the subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office appropriations of the Appropriations Committee at this time; as one who served for 2 years as chairman of that subcommittee and who has gone into this question for three successive years, I believe as carefully as any question of that kind has ever been investigated; and as one who has served on three conference committees in which this question has been one of the sharp questions before the conference, I am convinced that the interest of economy would be advanced by increasing the collection force of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I know that common justice would be served to a great extent than it could be served if there were not adequate investigative and collection forces available in connection with our internal revenue collections.

At various times during the past 3 years we have had before us a carefully prepared list showing the production in collections resulting from the increased force in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. There can be no question in the world as to the return to the Government in dollars from this additional expenditure for personnel. Furthermore, there will be a greater voluntary payment of taxes when the reluctant taxpayer realizes the advantages of voluntary payment, as opposed to the penalties of payment under coercion.

Before the vote is taken, I believe it might be well for us to examine the objections which are raised in the House of Representatives to the requested increase. The chief objection we have heard, and the one we heard in conference, is that a moderate increase, which was fixed at 1,500 by the end of the current year, was justified, but that any increase above that was not justified, the argument being that it was impossible to recruit more than that number of trained personnel within that period. That argument was made last year and also the year before. It had more force then than it has now. I undertake to say that at the present time more men trained in accountancy and in internal tax matters are available for employment than have been available at any previous time since prior to World War II. Likewise there are now more persons to whom the salary is attractive than there previously have been. I believe that the argument in opposition has so much less strength now than it had in times of high employment that the argument for making an increase to the extent requested is far stronger than it has previously been at any time.

To my mind, the sound thing for the Government to do, the sound thing for the people of the United States to do, and the only thing the Members of Congress can do in carrying out their oath of office is to furnish the Bureau of Internal Revenue with the greatest possible strength which can be provided, so that it can do the job which Congress has imposed upon it.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is is not also true that if we postpone for another year this enforcement program, the statute of limitations will have run against a considerable number of potential claims which the Treasury Department might otherwise have been able to assert?

Mr. CORDON. Yes. Every year the number of outlawed claims becomes greater, and that is a particular dangerous situation now, because we are at the far end of the period of the statute of limitations in the case of the swollen incomes accumulated during the war period. Either we shall get the taxes on them now, or we shall never get them.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How are the 7,000 appointees proposed to be allocated? Can they be sent anywhere the Bureau desires to send them?

Mr. CORDON. They are allocated, in the discretion of the Bureau, to the areas where the returns indicate there is the

greatest need for careful checking. Of course the greatest number will naturally go to the areas where there was the greatest rise in incomes during the war period.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is a very pleasant and exhilarating experience through which I am going at the moment, and I wish to congratulate all my Democratic and Republican brethren for interesting themselves in such a righteous cause. I am sure the conferees on the part of the House will be much impressed with the amendments which we have proposed to this important bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina that the Senate further insist upon its amendments Nos. 5, 6, and 7, request a further conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the delegation of the United States of America, to the Second World Health Organization Assembly meeting at Rome, Italy.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—77

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Martin
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Millikin
Bridges	Holland	Morse
Butler	Humphrey	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Murray
Cain	Ives	Myers
Capehart	Jenner	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Downey	Knowland	Taft
Eastland	Langer	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Long	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Lucas	Thye
George	McCarran	Tobey
Gillette	McCarthy	Tydings
Graham	McClellan	Vandenberg
Green	McFarland	Watkins
Gurney	McKellar	Wherry
Hayden	McMahon	Young
Hendrickson	Malone	

NOT VOTING—19

Baldwin	Magnuson	Stennis
Bricker	Miller	Wagner
Ecton	O'Conor	Wiley
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Williams
Fulbright	Reed	Withers
Kem	Saltonstall	
McGrath	Smith, N. J.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is unanimously agreed to; and the Chair appoints the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 41. An act for the relief of the city of Reno, Nev.;

S. 646. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion;

S. 647. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary;

S. 676. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion; and

S. 1089. An act to amend section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, relating to marketing agreements and orders, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue orders under such section with respect to filberts and almonds.

REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO THE NAVAL SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1794) entitled "An act to repeal certain obsolete provisions of law relating to the naval service," to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, the following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

Section 434, Revised Statutes.

That portion of the first sentence of section 436, Revised Statutes, which reads as follows: "or professor of mathematics"; and the second sentence of said section, which reads as follows: "Such officer or professor, when so employed, shall be entitled to receive the shore-duty pay of his grade, and no other."

Section 1367, Revised Statutes.
Section 1381, Revised Statutes.
Section 1401, Revised Statutes.
Section 1402, Revised Statutes.
Section 1403, Revised Statutes.
Section 1404, Revised Statutes.
Section 1408, Revised Statutes.
Section 1409, Revised Statutes.
Section 1417, Revised Statutes, as amended.
Section 1435, Revised Statutes.
Section 1480, Revised Statutes, as amended.
Section 1537, Revised Statutes.
Section 1538, Revised Statutes.
Section 1539, Revised Statutes.
Section 1564, Revised Statutes.
Section 1600, Revised Statutes.
Section 4750, Revised Statutes.
Section 4752, Revised Statutes.
Section 4753, Revised Statutes.
Section 4754, Revised Statutes.
Section 4755, Revised Statutes.

Paragraph 22 of the act of September 28, 1850, which is the fourth full paragraph on page 515, volume 9, Statutes at Large, and which reads as follows:

"And the pay of the superintendent of the naval school at Annapolis shall be at the rate allowed to an officer of his rank, when in service at sea."

Joint Resolution No. 25 of March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 825).

Paragraph 6 of the act of May 4, 1878, which is the second full paragraph on page 50, volume 20, Statutes at Large, and which reads as follows:

"That on and after the 1st day of July, 1878, there shall be no appointments made from civil life of secretaries or clerks to the admiral, or vice admiral, when on sea service, commanders of squadrons, or of clerks to commanders of vessels; and an officer not above the grade of lieutenant shall be detailed to perform the duties of secretary to the admiral or vice admiral, when on sea service, and one not above the grade of master to perform the duties of clerk to a rear admiral, or commander, and one not above the grade of ensign to perform the duties of clerk to a captain, commander, or lieutenant commander when afloat: *Provided*, That the secretaries and clerks in service on the 1st day of July, 1878, on vessels abroad, shall continue as such until such vessel shall return to the United States on the termination of its cruise."

So much of the fifth paragraph of the act of March 3, 1883, as it appears on page 473, volume 22, Statutes at Large, and which reads as follows: "And all officers of the Navy shall be credited with the actual time they may have served as officers or enlisted men in the regular or volunteer Army or Navy, or both, and shall receive all the benefits of such actual service in all respects in the same manner as if all said service had been continuous and in the regular Navy in the lowest grade having graduated pay held by such officer since last entering the service: *Provided*, That nothing in this clause shall be so construed as to authorize any change in the dates of commission or in the relative rank of such officer: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to give any additional pay to any such officer during the time of his service in the volunteer Army or Navy."

Section 2 of the act of August 3, 1886 (24 Stat. 215), as amended.

So much of section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, as it appears on page 210, volume 25, Statutes at Large, and which reads as follows: "shall receive the sea pay of his grade, and * * *."

The second paragraph under the heading "Pay of the Navy" of the act of March 3, 1901, which is the first full paragraph on page 1108, volume 31, Statutes at Large, and which reads as follows:

"That the advancement in rank of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, whensoever made, for service rendered during the war with Spain, pursuant, respectively, to the provisions of sections 1506 and 1605 of the Revised Statutes, shall not interfere with the regular promotion of officers otherwise entitled to promotion, but officers so advanced, by reason of war service, shall, after they are promoted to higher grades, be carried thereafter as additional to the numbers of each grade to which they may at any time be promoted; and each such officer shall hereafter be promoted in due course, contemporaneously with and to take rank next after the officer immediately above him; and all advancements made by reason of war service shall be appropriately so designated upon the official Navy list: *Provided, however,* That no promotion shall be made to fill a vacancy occasioned by the promotion, retirement, death, resignation, or dismissal of any officer who, at the time of such promotion, retirement, death, resignation, or dismissal, is an additional member of his grade under the foregoing provisions."

So much of the first sentence after the subheading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts" of the act of March 18, 1904, as it appears on page 121, volume 33, Statutes at Large, and which reads as follows: "a civilian assistant, who shall perform the duties of chief clerk, and in case of the death, resignation, sickness, or absence of both the Paymaster General of the Navy or his assistant, now provided for by law, unless otherwise directed by the President, as provided by section 179, Revised Statutes, such civilian assistant shall become the acting chief of the Bureau."

So much of the fourth paragraph under the subheading "Increase of the Navy, equipment" of the act of May 13, 1908, as it appears on page 159, volume 35, Statutes at Large, and which reads as follows: "and monitors now owned by the United States or hereafter built may be named as the President may direct."

The second paragraph under the subheading "Contingent, Navy" of the act of March 4, 1911, which appears on page 1267, volume 36, Statutes at Large, and which reads as follows:

"That officers on the active list of the line of United States Navy who, under authority of law, now perform engineering duty on shore only are hereby made additional to the numbers in the grades in which they are now serving, and shall be carried as additional to the numbers of each grade to which they may hereafter be promoted: *Provided,* That said officers shall be entitled to all the benefits of retirement under existing or future laws equally with other officers of like rank and service."

The second paragraph under the subheading "Contingent, Navy," of the act of March 3, 1915, which appears on page 930, volume 38, Statutes at Large, and which reads as follows:

"Hereafter officers who now perform engineering duty on shore only and officers of the Construction Corps shall be eligible for any shore duty compatible with their rank and grade to which the Secretary of the Navy may assign them."

The ninth paragraph under the subheading "Improvement of construction plants" of the act of March 3, 1915, which appears on page 945, volume 38, Statutes at Large, and which reads as follows:

"Officers of the line of the Navy who have had not less than 3 years' service in the grade of ensign and have taken or are taking satisfactorily a post-graduate course in naval architecture under orders from the Secretary of the Navy shall be eligible for transfer to the grade of assistant naval constructors: *Provided,* That there shall not be more than five such transfers in any one calendar year and that the total increase in the number of naval constructors and assistant naval constructors by reason of such transfers shall not exceed 24."

The following portions of the act of August 29, 1916, chapter 417, volume 39, Statutes at Large, page 556:

(a) Paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. 11, 12, 13, 18, 21, and 23 under the heading "Naval Flying Corps" in such chapter, which appear on pages 582, 583, 584, 585, and 586.

(b) The last full paragraph, as amended, under the heading "Naval Militia and National Naval Volunteers" in such chapter, which is the fourth full paragraph on page 600.

(c) So much of the third paragraph under the subheading "Increase of the Navy, ammunition" in such chapter, as it appears on pages 617 and 618, and which reads as follows:

"That each and every employee of the navy yards, gun factories, naval stations, and arsenals of the United States Government is hereby granted 30 days' leave of absence each year, without forfeiture of pay during such leave: *Provided further,* That it shall be lawful to allow pro rata leave only to those serving 12 consecutive months or more: *And provided further,* That in all cases the heads of divisions shall have discretion as to the time when the leave can best be allowed: *And provided further,* That not more than 30 days' leave with pay shall be allowed any such employee in 1 year: *Provided further,* That this provision shall not be construed to deprive employees of any sick leave or legal holidays to which they may now be entitled under existing law."

So much of the first paragraph under the heading "Pay, miscellaneous" of the act of July 1, 1918, which appears on page 705, volume 40, Statutes at Large, and which reads as follows: "*Provided,* That hereafter the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay the amounts due on all claims for damages to and loss of private property of inhabitants of any European country not an enemy or ally of an enemy when the amount of the claim does not exceed the sum of $1,000, occasioned and caused by men in the naval service during the period of the present war, all payments in settlement of such claims to be made out of 'Pay, miscellaneous.'"

Paragraph 6 of section 3 (Personnel) of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767).

The last two paragraphs under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel" in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes," approved June 11, 1930 (46 Stat. 567, ch. 463), concerning the discharge of minors in the Navy and Marine Corps.

Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the act of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1482).

Act of July 17, 1935 (49 Stat. 482).

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a brief explanation, in case the Senate would like to know what is involved in the House amendment. The Military Establishment made a review of many laws which have been on the statute books a long while and which are no longer applicable to the present Military Establishment. Some of them are not being observed. I may be in error, but as I recall one of the laws, was that the Army Band could only play at GAR encampments. Ostensibly it could not play at any other ceremony or function. But the Navy Band or the Marine Corps Band could do so. It relates to things that have happened throughout the years.

The bill passed the Senate, and when the proposal to repeal these obsolete laws which are no longer applicable reached the House, it was found some changes were desirable, some additions and subtractions in a small number of the things acted upon. I think there are several score of laws which are repealed by this measure, which has already passed the Senate. All the House amendment does is to make certain corrections of errors which have since become apparent. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for himself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the so-called Thomas substitute.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, it has been recorded that the old Goths of Germany in their primitive assemblies debated every important question twice, once when drunk and once when sober—sober to assure wisdom and decorum; drunk to promote courage and vigor of action. I have no first-hand information concerning either the decorum or sobriety that prevailed during the passage of the Taft-Hartley law with which we struggle and under which millions suffer humiliation and distress. But certainly those who voted for this act must have been wholly free from the influence of any stimulating liquor or soothing drug. Otherwise, they would, either by accident or design, have failed to make it the most tyrannical measure ever placed upon the statute book of the Nation.

Certainly all Democrats should be absolutely sober when deciding whether they will, by appeasing amendments, underwrite the Taft-Hartley law and thereby enable the Republican hierarchy, with its fabulous wealth and unlimited newspaper support, to shift to democracy the blame for the perpetuation of this iniquity which, in the last election, cost the Grand Old Party the control of the White House and both branches of the Congress.

Mr. President, before embarking on the tempestuous, boundless, and harborless sea of the Taft-Hartley debate, let me digress for a moment to pay a richly deserved tribute of genuine appreciation

to the illustrious senior Senator, statesman, and humanitarian, Dr. ELBERT THOMAS of Utah, for the great service he has most wisely, patriotically, and patiently rendered the people of the United States in introducing and pushing to its present place in this body Senate bill 249, designed to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and otherwise promote the general welfare.

The Senator from Utah, like the Apostle Paul, has fought a good fight. He has kept the faith. It is my firm belief that there is laid up for him a crown of righteousness. It is my hope that, at the proper time, in the very distant future an imposing statue of this great statesman will be placed in the rotunda of the Capitol and that on its pedestal these simple words of truth will forever appear: "He lived to bless mankind."

Mr. President, let me postpone for another brief moment my extemporaneous remarks on the proposed amendments to the Thomas bill and say a word about the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], for whose character and courage I have great respect. I deeply appreciate his happy faculty of occasionally helping to make possible a great national Democratic victory. The Senator has just achieved a new distinction. If certain Democrats in high places whom I have in mind, but must not name, could be classified as fish, the Senator from Ohio should be considered a greater angler than Izaak Walton ever was or ever hoped to be. Izaak could catch nothing without bait. But the Senator from Ohio has, on Capitol Hill, with nothing but an unbaited, stark naked Taft-Hartley hook caught a school of suckers that defies comparison and makes the surviving, pining remnant of the Republican Party shout for joy.

Mr. President, I now proceed to a brief discussion of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and that proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. To both these amendments and also to any others designed to restrict or weaken the Thomas bill, I am unalterably opposed.

Either the Taft or Douglas amendment, if adopted, would increase or tend to increase the power of the President. No augmentation of his power is desirable or necessary. In the hands of Harry Truman added power would be safe. In the hands of a successor it might be abused and abused with disastrous results to the Nation.

The Taft amendment provides that, in certain contingencies, labor may be governed by injunction. The Douglas amendment, by implication, also provides injunction government which labor, as a result of its long and bitter experience with this curse, hates above every other earthly instrumentality of oppression.

The Douglas amendment provides for the seizure of property. There is not a lawyer in this body who does not know the ruling in the Mine Workers case in which the Supreme Court held that, if the President seizes property in a so-called emergency, he can also obtain an injunction to protect that property. Under such an injunction, he could compel men and women to continue to labor for the same wages and under the same conditions that prevailed at the time the property was seized. He could prevent workers from striking. He could impose every burden upon the toilers, under the implied provisions of the Douglas amendment, that could be imposed under the express language of the Taft amendment.

The Douglas amendment is vitiated by its relationship to the Taft-Hartley law. In proof of this relationship, I have the testimony of that great fisher of men, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

My campaign pledges to the toilers of West Virginia to vote and work for the repeal of every sentence, syllable and sound of the Taft-Hartley Act, and to oppose any new legislation that contains any of its provisions or implications, will compel me to vote against the Douglas amendment.

The deadliest poisons in the cup of both the Taft and Douglas amendments are the provisions for the labor injunction. Whether it be authorized by express language or by implication would make no difference in practical effect.

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

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that under the Taft proposal the President can obtain an injunction and send the men back to work for private employers, whereas, under the Aiken-Douglas amendment, such an injunction cannot be obtained? Is not that correct?

Mr. NEELY. The Taft amendment specifically provides for Government by injunction. Under the Douglas amendment, after the seizure by the President, his right to an injunction relative to the property or its operation would be as deep as the ocean and as high as the sky.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But not to send the employees back to work for a private employer—only after the Government has seized the property.

Mr. NEELY. There is that technical distinction between the Taft amendment and the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, but, in my judgment, it is a distinction without a difference, for both amendments are based on the theory that the court injunction should be used to settle labor disputes. I am unalterably opposed to the use of this deadly weapon against labor by any man, no matter how high his title or how famous his name.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is a very vital distinction.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois in one of his speeches on the floor of the Senate—and they are always good—referred to the well-known 99.44 percent purity of Ivory soap. In my opinion, about the same percentage of the Douglas amendment is, in effect, a reincarnation of the Taft-Hartley law. But if the amendment contained only a scintilla of the hated Taft-Hartley Act, I would oppose it in strict accordance with the Democratic platform on which I was elected, and in conformity with my campaign promises to the people of West Virginia.

Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that the Thomas bill will be passed in its present form and that all efforts to cripple it will fail.

An unlearned old woman was asked what she thought of the King James version of the Bible. She replied, "If it was good enough for King James, it's good enough for me." [Laughter.] So with the Thomas bill, it is good enough for me. And in spite of the world, the flesh and the devil, I intend to support that bill against all appeasers, compromisers, and violators of platform pledges and campaign promises.

Mr. President, in 1896 the Democratic Party began its ceaseless, tireless campaign against the government of labor by injunction. The Democratic platform of that year, in most vigorous language, denounced the use of the injunction in labor disputes. At least two later Democratic platforms have contained anti-injunction provisions.

The last Democratic platform promised the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, which was simply another way of declaring against government by injunction. And should the Democratic Party be against such government? A few illustrations will sufficiently answer that question.

In my home State of West Virginia, the antilabor injunction has been employed to prevent the giving of a crust of bread or a cup of cold water to a hungry or thirsty striking workingman. Anyone violating such injunction could be fined and sent to jail. This detested form of government has been used to prevent more than three striking toilers being together on a public highway at the same time. In a number of cases, men have been sent to jail for having violated injunctions against peaceably urging their friends to join legitimate labor unions.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in September 1917 Judge Langham issued an injunction which restrained striking miners "from congregating on the Magyar Presbyterian Church lot or any other lot, lots, or places at the time the employees of the plaintiff enter the mine and at the time the employees of the plaintiff come out of the mine; from singing a song or songs in the hearing of the employees of the plaintiff of a threatening or hostile nature.

Subsequently an investigating committee of the Senate found and reported that the church in question was on a lot owned by the local union, and that some of the hymns which the miners were enjoined from singing were the following: The Victory May Depend Upon You; Nearer My God to Thee; Stand Up, Stand Up for Jesus.

Your attention is now invited to the devastating manner in which the injunction has been used against labor under the Taft-Hartley law by one Robert Denham, general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board. I read from the testimony of Mr. Randolph, who is the supreme head of the renowned Typographical Union of the United States—testimony that was given before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

1. We have been compelled to spend over $11,000,000 of members' hard-earned dues in support of strikes and other defense activi-

ties to preserve the union against the Taft-Hartley Act.

2. We have been subjected to the issuance of eight complaints—

And I construe that to mean complaints which are enforceable by court injunction—

containing substantially identical allegations and relying on the same evidence, by General Counsel Denham of the NLRB.

We have been forced to engage in five long drawn-out NLRB proceedings, covering substantially the entire country, at great expense to ourselves and our members, without having obtained a single decision from the NLRB in the course of 16 months of litigation.

3. We have been forced to submit to a sweeping injunction and to a contempt action under that injunction, brought by NLRB attorneys for the chief purpose of breaking a strike of our members at Chicago, Ill., which has continued since November 24, 1947. The only redeeming feature of our experience under the Taft-Hartley Act has been that, despite the best efforts of a coalition of newspaper publishers, General Counsel Denham, the NLRB, and the Federal courts, that strike has not been broken. Nor will it be ended until we have the employers' assurances that they will concede us the same right to live that we so freely concede to them.

4. Collective bargaining in our industry has been carried on, not with our employers, but with General Counsel Denham and the Federal courts.

We demonstrate that this interference with the processes of collective bargaining has gone so far that we were held in contempt of court for, among other things, failing to include a provision for a neutral "tie breaker" in a proposed contract clause setting up a joint employer-union committee for the training of apprentices.

We believe that this is the first time in American history where either a union or an employer was held guilty of violating the law for failing to place some language in a proposal made in the course of collective bargaining, which the employers were free to reject, and frequently did.

I should emphasize that, during this entire course of litigation, when NLRB attorneys cooperating with employers watched the behavior of every member of the ITU, it has never even been alleged that the officers or members of the ITU:

1. Have engaged in violence, fraud, misrepresentation, threats, or any other conduct which could properly be called improper.

2. Have discriminated in employment or caused employers to discriminate in employment against any individual. No person has even filed a charge that he has been discriminated against by any action of our organization.

3. Have unjustly or improperly suspended or expelled any member from our organization, or improperly or unjustly refused to admit any person to membership.

4. Have been guilty of any financial impropriety, or have denied any member the democratic rights which he has as a member of our union, or have done other than enforce the union rules, democratically adopted by the members themselves.

As Trial Examiner Leff found in the case brought by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association:

"Respondents (the ITU) urge in justification of their conduct that their motive and intent was to preserve the union and promote its economic interests. I have no doubt that this was true."

Note that this is what the trial examiner said about this labor organization.

But, under Taft-Hartley, "preserving the union and promoting its economic interests" is illegal. It is for that reason that it should be repealed.

* * * the injunctive power under Taft-Hartley is far worse than anything that preceded the Norris-LaGuardia Act; that General Counsel Denham, certainly not with the disapproval of the National Labor Relations Board, has administered the Taft-Hartley Act in a biased and hostile manner; that the so-called "watchdog committee" has been used to interfere with the affairs of the executive branch of the Government; that injunctive actions under Taft-Hartley are speedy, but clarification of the law by the NLRB is delayed for weary months running into years; and that the law is so unjust, confused, and contradictory that amending it is impossible.

This experience, plus our analysis of S. 249, as amended, convince us that the Taft-Hartley law should be immediately replaced by S. 249, with certain reservations noted in our analysis of the measure.

There have been insertions made in the RECORD showing the manner in which Mr. Denham has used the injunction to the prejudice of employees in various walks of life. In my opinion, it has been conclusively shown that Mr. Denham is a tyrant such as the world has not seen since the days of the ancient Roman Empire. In my judgment, he is the only Federal official, past or present, living or dead, who ever entertained a desire similar to that of Caligula who wished that the Roman people had only one head so that he could chop it off with a single blow. Apparently, Mr. Denham's wish concerning working men and women is identical with that voiced by the heartless Roman oppressor for the agonized victims of his fiendish persecution.

The only language in any literature with which I am familiar that expresses what I believe to be the opinion of Robert Denham held by the toilers of America is the language which was used by Martin Luther in describing the great philosopher Aristotle. It is as follows:

He is truly a devil, a horrid calumniator, a wicked sycophant, a prince of darkness, a real Apollyon, a beast, a horrid imposter on mankind, one in whom there is scarcely any philosophy, and a goat—this twice execrable Aristotle.

Oh, for a modern Martin Luther to characterize Denham according to his deserts. Our only effectual way to dispose of him and the labor injunction is to pass the Thomas bill.

Some invisible spirit of evil is haunting this side of the Senate Chamber, whispering to the overcredulous, seductive temptations to make a record in this historic parliamentary battle upon which they could later enticingly say to such powerful organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers:

We Democrats made the Thomas bill as good as the Taft-Hartley Act. Hereafter, show your gratitude by giving your fabulous campaign contributions to our party and by lending it your undivided support.

Let no one be deceived by this nonsense. Democracy never has received and never should receive from plutocracy even as much as the crumbs that Lazarus received from the rich man's table. No matter how much we appease, no matter how much we compromise, no matter how much we repudiate the Democratic platform, big business and big money will, in the future as in the past, be with the party of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Those with hearts as hard as Pharaoh's and eyes as dry as Sahara should weep for the Democratic appeasers when they are forced to the extremity of trying to mollify their outraged labor constituents with such spurious, pitiful pleas of confession and avoidance as:

We rendered you great service! We obliterated the label on the Taft-Hartley law; we tore the Taft-Hartley law to pieces; of these we then retrieved the labor injunction and the seizure of property and forced them into the beneficent Thomas bill—to its ruination. But we nevertheless passed the Thomas bill in its emasculated form and for all this labor should be everlastingly grateful!

The average toiler's resentful rejoinder to such a plea would probably curdle the blood of even a Democratic appeaser.

If our compromisers should unexpectedly obtain the approval of their present proposals, the Democratic Party would enter the next campaign with labor cursing it "up hill and down" for having betrayed it. For the devastating loss of the labor vote, there would not be a single plutocratic gain.

After some of our recently initiated members have had a little more experience with a few of their superpolitical Republican colleagues, they will know better than to accept flattering invitations to violate Democratic platform pledges, or pleas to help perpetuate desolating Republican laws. They will, sooner or later, learn to say to their would-be seducers the substance of what an elderly man, by the name of Knight in my native County of Doddridge, said near the conclusion of a great revival meeting 60 years ago.

There had been many conversions, much shouting, and prolonged singing of processional hymns. The time for thanksgiving finally came and with it a general demand for Brother Knight to lead in prayer. He promptly responded as follows:

We are thankful to see all who pretend that their sins have been washed away. But, dear Lord, if you only knew these old backsliding hypocrites as well as I do, you wouldn't believe a word they say. You would know that, all told, they won't have a scintilla of religion at the end of 30 days. [Laughter.]

Those who are tempting our faltering Democratic brethren are, in matters political, just as unreliable as Brother Knight believed his neighbors, in general, to be.

The Taft-Hartleyites will later deny our appeasers as Peter denied the Man of Galilee; they will later sell these appeasers to defeat as Judas sold the sinless Saviour to crucifixion. In this case, the voters will eventually do the crucifying and every Democrat who repudiates his party platform pledges had better prepare himself for the cross.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to make certain what the implication of the Senator from West Virginia is. Is he charging that I am attempting to get campaign funds from large contributors by

helping, with others, to sponsor these amendments?

Mr. NEELY. No. The Senator is too great and good and has too high a sense of honor to accept a tainted contribution, but some of those who are patting the Senator on the back are in a different class. Reactionary papers that never supported the Democratic Party are saying gracious things about the Senator. They are extravagantly commending his statesmanlike approach to the Taft-Hartley law. To me these kept papers are much more dangerous than Greeks bearing gifts. I hope the Senator will say to them, one and all, "Get thee behind me, Satan."

Mr. President, I shall continue to do everything in my power to bury the infamy known as the Taft-Hartley law, regardless of the good faith of those who enacted it. I shall endeavor to hide it in a deep, dark grave which, like the sepulcher of Moses, no man will ever see. It is my hope that no trumpet will ever resurrect the wicked remains from the dead.

It is my further hope that the Thomas bill will be passed and that all the blessings of the Wagner law will be restored. When I speak on the final question of repealing the Taft-Hartley Act, I shall prove by facts as convincing as a geometrical demonstration that not only labor but also the great corporations and every class of the American people for a dozen years under the Wagner Act enjoyed greater prosperity, freedom, and happiness than mankind ever knew since God first said, "Let there be light."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for himself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the so-called Thomas substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Hunt	Myers
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Cain	Jenner	Pepper
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Knowland	Taft
Downey	Langer	Taylor
Eastland	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McCarran	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Tobey
Fulbright	McClellan	Tydings
George	McFarland	Vandenberg
Gillette	McGrath	Watkins
Graham	McKellar	Wherry
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Withers
Hayden	Malone	Young
Hendrickson	Martin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak about 5 minutes on this question. I am saying that, because I hope at the end of 5 minutes the Senate may take a vote. If I do not say I am going to speak 5 minutes, I know the propensities of my colleagues to leave the Chamber.

I joined with the Senator from Illinois in proposing the amendment to the Ives amendment, because I feel, as I have felt from the very beginning of this session of the Congress, that only through a bipartisan nonpolitical approach could any improved labor legislation be put upon the statute books at this time. If there is anything that should be approached in an open, fair-minded, nonpolitical manner, I believe it is the welfare of the laboring people of this country. I feel, too, that it is our duty, if we cannot get a bill exactly as each one of us would have it, to endeavor to get the best possible bill for all concerned.

We are in this bill, not legislating for labor, we are not legislating for industry or employers. We are legislating for all the people of the United States. I try to keep that constantly in mind in making determinations as to how I shall vote on the various provisions of the bill as they come before the Senate.

It seems to me that there are three methods of approach to the problem which is immediately before us. First, how shall we cope with strikes which affect the national health and security? We can assume, as the original Thomas bill assumes, that the President has unlimited power to deal with strikes in his own way. I do not think that is a proper assumption to make at all. I feel that it is a very dangerous assumption, and that we should not enact legislation which assumes that the President possesses unlimited power to do anything which he is not prohibited from doing by the Constitution or by law.

Or we can take the approach which others advocate of throwing the responsibility which properly belongs to the executive department into the lap of Congress every time a strike of this nature occurs. Again, I submit that is not the proper approach. The founding fathers divided the duties of government among the legislative, executive and judicial branches. Let us keep the executive branch responsible for the work which properly belongs to that department. We should expect the President to exhaust every means within the scope of the executive department to handle strikes of a national emergency nature, before they are tossed into the lap of the Congress.

The third method of approach in dealing with strikes affecting the national health and welfare is to prescribe a course of action to be followed by the President, to the fullest extent, before calling upon the Congress, in the handling of strikes of that nature.

As I have said, I am opposed to the Ives amendment for the simple reason that it tosses into the lap of Congress responsibility properly belonging to the President and the executive branch of the Congress. I cannot conceive that any better settlement of a strike of a national emergency nature can be obtained by throwing it into the lap of Congress, than by having it handled by the President, so long as the President uses the tools which we provide him in dealing with such a matter.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio provides, indeed, tools for the President to use, but it provides that the President can use either injunction or seizure, or both. I do not believe that the President should be given authority to use the injunction on behalf of a private employer. I think he should be given the right to use all necessary means in order to protect the rights of the United States, after the Government has taken possession of property which is vital to the health and security of all our people.

The amendment which is offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself provides that the Government may seize any plant which is vital to the national security and hold it for a period not to exceed 90 days. The very fact that the property is in the hands of the United States Government and is being operated by the Government carries with it authority for the President to use such means as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States. I believe we have provided in our amendment that neither industry nor labor shall benefit unduly by reason of the President's power of seizure. We provide that the owners of the plant shall be given just compensation for the use of the plant while it is in the hands of the Government. Perhaps industry will object to that, because it is conceivable that if injunction alone can be used to keep the employees working for industry, very large profits might be made during that period because of the scarcity of the product which the plant produces.

I do not believe that the employer should be given the unfair advantage of having the Government operate his plant for him and make excessive profits, nor should he be given the advantage of having the Government use an injunction to enforce employees to work for him.

We also provide that labor shall have no unwarranted benefits by reason of seizure of a plant, because in the amendment which we offer we state that the plant shall be operated during the time it is in the possession of the United States on the terms and conditions under which it was being operated at the time it was seized. It seems to me that is much fairer than are any of the other amendments which are proposed, and I hope that the amendment which we are offering to the Ives amendment will be approved by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the Douglas-Aiken amendment to the Ives amendment to the Thomas substitute. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McGRATH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the delegation of the United States of America, to the Second World Health Organization Assembly meeting at Rome, Italy.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of illness.

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

On this vote the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent and his pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] has been previously announced. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who is necessarily absent is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—27

Aiken	Hayden	McCarran
Anderson	Hill	McFarland
Douglas	Hunt	McKellar
Downey	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Frear	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Kefauver	Sparkman
Gillette	Kerr	Tobey
Graham	Long	Tydings
Green	Lucas	Withers

NAYS—55

Brewster	Hoey	Murray
Bricker	Holland	Neely
Bridges	Humphrey	Pepper
Butler	Ives	Reed
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Chapman	Knowland	Taft
Chavez	Langer	Taylor
Connally	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McMahon	Thye
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Williams
Gurney	Millikin	Young
Hendrickson	Morse	
Hickenlooper	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—14

Baldwin	McGrath	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Miller	Stennis
Ellender	O'Conor	Wagner
Kem	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Lodge	Saltonstall	

So the amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS, on behalf of himself and Mr. AIKEN, to the amendment of Mr. IVES to so-called Thomas substitute, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the so-called Thomas substitute.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not care to take much of the time of the Senate, but I should like to point out exactly on what the Senate is about to vote in this particular instance.

The amendment which has been offered by me is an amendment to the Thomas bill. Therefore the question which arises is whether the Senate prefers the approach which I am offering to the approach which is offered in the Thomas bill.

I point out that my proposal goes two steps further than the Thomas proposal. I have in mind the proclamation of the emergency by the President, the establishment of the emergency board, the period during which the emergency board must act and then report. Then I go further. I require that if at any time after the emergency board shall have been appointed work shall cease, or, if work prior to that time shall have ceased and shall not be resumed, the President must bring to the attention of the Congress, if the Congress be in session, or through a special call of the Congress if it be not in session, the situation which exists, including the recommendation of the emergency board, if such recommendation will have been made, and such a report and such recommendation as the President himself may desire to make.

My proposal requires that in the meantime, during all this procedure, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall be at work with the emergency board trying to adjust the differences.

I believe that, in brief, is the distinction between the proposal I offer, and on which the vote is now about to be taken, and that which has been offered by the Senator from Utah in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to speak on this matter at some length. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, desires to continue the session longer or not, but I wish to discuss the particular amendment now pending, which I have not discussed heretofore.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator how long he expects to speak?

Mr. TAFT. Fifteen or twenty minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. The Senate will sit that long. I agreed the Senate might remain in session until 7 o'clock.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as Senators know, the question which the Senate is considering, and has been considering for about 2 weeks, is what is to be done when there is a strike which threatens the national safety or health. While the importance of the matter is very great, yet to some extent I think it is exaggerated, because the particular procedure we are considering would apply perhaps, only in one strike out of a thousand.

Labor-management relations are handled in the ordinary currents of negotiation in thousands of different industries and thousands of different plants. The particular procedure we are considering does not apply to them. The general labor-management relations are governed by other provisions of the proposed act. The feature we are considering will deal only with a great emergency strike. It will deal only with a situation where the public interest is involved.

The injunctions being discussed are not for the benefit of any private employer, as they are now provided for under the Taft-Hartley law to deal with emergencies. They are injunctions in the interest of the public, and only in the interest of the public, and only when the question of the national safety or health is involved.

I understand the President has refused to intervene, under the Taft-Hartley law, in the present lamentable situation in Hawaii, although Hawaii is perhaps threatened with lack of food and lack of other supplies, because the national safety and health are not involved, but only the safety and health of a particular territory are involved.

What we are considering is an emergency proposal. The question is, What are we to do when we confront such a situation? We hope we may not ever be in such a situation, but what happens when there is a national emergency?

Public intention is not seriously centered in such a matter until the contract between the parties expires. The parties are meeting, and the general assumption of the people is that they are going to settle their differences. Up to the very last day there is always hope that they will settle their troubles between themselves. Up to that point the matter is solely between the employers and the employees. The public says the parties have a right to continue their negotiations. Usually there is a Federal mediator working in an attempt to get the parties to agree, and in the great majority of cases, probably, he gets them to agree. But at the last moment the negotiations may suddenly break down, and for the first time public attention is centered on what is a threat to the safety and health of the people of the United

States. For the first time it becomes a great problem. What are we going to do about it? Under the Taft-Hartley Act, and as is proposed by our amendment, the first thing to do would be to hold the status quo for 60 days at least, or 80 days, while the President tried to settle the differences between the parties; or the President would call upon them to continue work for 60 days, and appoint an emergency board to deal with the problem. Then for the first time the spotlight of public opinion would be on that particular difficulty between the workmen and the companies by whom they are employed.

What does the Ives amendment propose to do? It proposes that Congress shall be called into session, if it is not already in session, and that Congress shall settle the problem. In my opinion, that is an improper procedure. I think what ought to be done is to say, "Hold this thing for 60 days, while the President takes action, with his great executive authority, with the force of public opinion back of him, with an emergency board at work, which looks into the circumstances, and tells the people of the country what the circumstances are."

The theory of the Taft-Hartley law and of the Taft amendment is that the status quo shall be maintained for 60 days, while settlement is attempted, when the spotlight of public opinion is on the situation for the first time, when the President, with all the force at his command and with all his great prestige, has begun to act, and when the Mediation Board has proceeded to act, that is our only purpose. The action would be only temporary. We do not undertake to say what ultimately should happen if a break-down should occur after the 60-day period. We leave that to Congress. By that time the Nation would be alerted. No doubt Congress would have prepared special provisions. The President would have time to work out the particular solution.

I said before that I think that if everything possible is done, and the 60-day period expires without a settlement, Congress may have to pass a special act for the particular emergency. It may be compulsory arbitration; it may be seizure; it may be anything that Congress wants to do. It may even be a congressional fixing of wages, which is at least suggested as a temporary measure in the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the Senator from Ohio also contemplated that when Congress is called into session there would be no guarantee that it would act, for it might run into a filibuster, because of some situation which could arise, so that it could not act by reason of the Senate rules?

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Maryland.

This is what would happen under the Ives amendment. Let us assume that negotiations have come to an end. The public spotlight is on the situation. Congress meets. I do not think Congress would be ready yet to act under those circumstances. It seems to me primarily the President should do his job.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if he believes Congress would be convened without having any knowledge of what had been going on, or without knowledge of the situation that might then exist?

Mr. TAFT. I think it would be possible, because we do not expect these emergencies to eventuate. We hear of such disputes; but we expect them to be settled on the last day of the contract. That is when most serious disputes are settled. People are not alerted to the emergency. What would happen if an emergency should arise? Congress would be called into session. What would Congress do? We would meet in a hurry. We would have presented to us perhaps some problem which we would have no time to consider, but with respect to which action must be taken; some measure would have to be put through immediately, otherwise the coal mines would be shut down, or the railroads would be shut down, or shipping would be stopped. If action were not taken by Congress results would ensue which would seriously threaten the national safety and the health of the people of the country and even threaten death and starvation to the people of the United States. Congress at once would be under pressure.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator honestly think that if there should be such a dire situation as he pictures, we would be faced with a filibuster at such a time?

Mr. TAFT. I have not reached the point of discussing that question, but I do not see why we might not be faced with such a situation. Suppose a fair number of Senators were convinced that the workers were absolutely right, or that the employers were absolutely right. The argument of those who believed the employees were absolutely right might be "No, the workers have the right to strike. They have the right to use the weapon of starvation to force their demands on the employers. We are going to talk while they continue to maintain the strike." That is entirely possible.

We have now a cloture rule. I think we could get it enforced, but by the time we could do so, and get the measure through the House, a period of several weeks might elapse, during which the strike would continue.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Ohio this question: Assuming that an injunction is imposed, and no agreement is arrived at, and the period of time the injunction is in effect expires. Then what would happen? Would we not be back exactly in the same situation we were in before?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but by that time public attention would have been focused on the case. Congress would probably be in session anyway. Congress might be devising some law to meet the situation. The President would be working on the problem of what he would recommend. Congress could consider the question for 2 or 3 weeks before the expiration of the 60 days, and take its time in doing what might have to be done, if action must be taken.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Assuming that Congress had knowledge of what had taken place during the 60-day period while the injunction was in force, why could we not also assume that Congress had knowledge of what was taking place at the time the differences of opinion were arising, and those differences of opinion were arising at the hour when the shut-down or strike occurred?

Mr. TAFT. Because there are dozens and dozens of contracts being negotiated in the United States today. We hopefully assume, optimistically perhaps, that they are all going to be settled, and that there is not going to be a break-down in the ordinary labor-management relations. We do not assume that there will be a break-down until the actual end of the contract day, and then there is no longer a contract.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to ask the able Senator from Ohio if he feels that after the 60-day period has elapsed, during which no work stoppage has occurred, but during which time the ill-feeling which existed at the start has increased——

Mr. TAFT. I do not agree with that at all.

Mr. IVES. Let me establish my premise, and then I shall ask the question.

Mr. TAFT. I dispute the premise.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from Ohio does not know what the premise is yet. Assume that during that period of time no agreement has been reached, that there has been no possibility of agreement because of conditions which may have existed. That is my premise. Assume the 60-day period has expired, and no final solution has been arrived at. Assume the feeling during that period of time has intensified. As a result of the fact that no agreement has been reached and the 60 days are at an end, the Congress is faced with a situation where the conflict—not, of course, physical, but mental at least—between the parties at interest, will have been greatly increased. Under those conditions, I ask the Senator from Ohio whether he thinks the Congress would be in as good a position to act on a question of that nature as it would have been had the matter been brought to it in the first instance?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I do. I dispute the Senator's premise. We direct the Mediation Board to act. The President has a mediation board at work. The President is working to avert a national emergency. I cannot conceive of a condition in which the parties would not be closer together at the end of 60 days than they were when they started. I cannot conceive of a case—except the one case in-

volving Mr. Bridges and the Pacific Coast Longshoremen's Union—where the 60-day period of injunction does not gradually work toward a solution of the controversy. I may say that in the Pacific Coast Longshoremen's case the feeling was just as strong when it started as when it ended. The feeling was just as strong at both times. It was a very difficult case with which to deal.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Ohio has agreed with the Senator from Maryland that under the Ives amendment a filibuster is possible. Does not the Senator from Ohio agree with the Senator from Illinois that a filibuster is possible at the conclusion of the injunction period, of the 60-day period, when Congress may attempt to write a law, in the event the national emergency dispute has not been adjusted through the emergency board by the end of the 60-day period?

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that there are 60 days in which we can meet. We can meet before the expiration of the 60-day period to deal with the situation which may possibly arise, and therefore I suggest that we would have possibly 2 weeks to consider the matter. I think a filibuster could be overcome under the present rules. A very determined filibuster might arise. There might be a filibuster on the motion to take up. There might be a filibuster on the bill itself. Each of those would require the filing of a cloture petition, which requires 2 days in each instance, in addition to some debate. It might be that that procedure would require 10 days or 2 weeks. I think we could deal with that question in a forehanded way if we saw it coming.

Mr. LUCAS. I am assuming that at the end of 60 days there has been no adjustment on the strike, and no settlement. No legislation has been perfected by the Congress. At the end of 60 days we are in session, and at that time we attempt immediately to enact legislation to meet the national emergency. The Senator will agree with me that that would be possible.

Mr. TAFT. That would be possible. Let me say to the Senator, however, that the condition which he suggests could be true under every amendment submitted to the Senate. It is no argument for or against any of the amendments we are considering to say that that condition might exist. It is an interesting speculation. What happens at the end of 60 days, under all these amendments, is left open to be determined by the action taken at that time.

My point is that at the end of 60 days we shall have had time to consider the problem and decide what the next step should be. We shall not have time to consider it if we insist that the President turn the whole matter over to Congress on the day on which management and labor fail to reach an agreement, and the men go out on strike. That is the point I wish to make.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator; but I did not want to let the RECORD stand with the impression that a filibuster would be possible only under the Ives amendment, and that no filibuster would be possible under the Taft amendment at the end of 60 days. The threat of a filibuster would apply to one amendment as well as to the other. No Senator should entertain the notion that the threat of a filibuster would apply only to the Ives amendment and would not apply to the other amendments.

Mr. TAFT. That is true. However, in this case we would have 60 days to consider the question. Under the Ives amendment we would be called together, and the President would be expressly denied the right of injunction, as I see it. He would be told that he must call Congress together. I do not believe the President ought to be able to pass the buck to Congress on the day the contract expires. I do not believe we feel that the buck should be passed to us at that particular moment. If we have warning, if the emergency has actually been threatened, if the courts have issued an injunction or the Government has seized the property and is working toward a settlement, if an Emergency Board has determined the facts—we would not have the facts when we were first called back—I believe that then, when everything else has failed, the question should come before Congress. But it does not seem to me that we ought to permit the President, every time a Nation-wide strike is called at the end of a contract, to pass the whole thing over to Congress and say, "You settle this strike."

I admit that my proposal is not a solution to the entire question. I believe that the legislation should provide for maintenance of the status quo for 60 days, while the parties try to agree, and while there is brought to bear every influence of public opinion, the influence of the Emergency Board, the influence of the Mediation Service, and the prestige of the President, to settle the strike. They have always worked before. We have never had Congress called upon to act except in two cases, and in those cases it is at least questionable whether it was absolutely necessary to call upon Congress to act.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the able Senator from Ohio if he does not recognize that there is a great difference between settling a dispute or a controversy and setting up the machinery by which the dispute or controversy is to be settled. In other words, does not the able Senator from Ohio realize that if an emergency dispute were brought before the Congress it would not be brought before the Congress for settlement? Rather it would be brought before the Congress for the purpose of having the Congress determine a procedure by which the settlement could be reached.

Mr. TAFT. If I were a Member of a Congress which was called together under such circumstances I would advocate the passage of the Taft-Hartley law to maintain the status quo for 60 days, with injunctions, or in any other way it could be done, while Congress was trying to work out a solution. Why not have such a law on the books, so that we would not have to enact a law under pressure, at a time when we would not know what the facts were, when the emergency board had not reported, and under circumstances in which we would be called together and told to settle the difficulty? The President could say, "You have said that you want to settle it. You have enacted a law providing that the President does not have to worry about it." All the President would have to do would be to pass it over to Congress. I think we would be "boobs" to enact any such legislation, or to assume any such responsibility. Therefore I believe that the pending amendment should be voted down.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the able Senator from Ohio if I am correct as to the parliamentary situation, in that this is the Ives amendment to the Thomas bill.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of the statement made by the able Senator from Ohio, I ask him, as between the Thomas bill and the Ives amendment, which he prefers.

Mr. TAFT. I think I prefer the Thomas bill. There is practically no substantial difference, except in one respect which I do not like, and that is that under the Ives amendment the entire emphasis is on the point that Congress shall be called into session at once, and shall solve the problem. That is not in the Thomas bill. As a matter of fact, the President already has full power to do everything he could do under the Ives amendment; and I think he already has full power to do everything he could do under the Thomas bill, without Congress enacting any law at all. I do not see that the situation would be changed. Perhaps the President would like a little more authority for his Emergency Board. Perhaps the Board might be able to get a little more information through subpenas, and so forth, but I do not believe that either proposal would substantially change what the President could do without the passage of any legislation at all.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to point out one or two things, in view of the statement just made by the Senator from Ohio that he prefers the Thomas approach to the one offered by the Senator from New York.

In the first place, the Senator from New York would like to point out to the Senate that there is a distinct difference between the procedure under the amendment offered by the Senator from New York and that provided in the Thomas bill—a difference not alone in the length of procedure or in the steps which must be taken, but also in the effect of the procedure.

One of the purposes the Senator from New York had in mind in providing this kind of procedure was to bring to the attention of the President the fact that, if he is to declare a national emergency, he should be sure that such emergency is national in scope. I dare say that under the provisions of my amendment the President would be definitely sure, in issuing a proclamation of the kind in

question, that he was dealing with a national emergency.

That takes care of one aspect of the matter which the Thomas bill does not cover, and which none of the other proposals covers.

In the second place, the able Senator from Ohio disregards something very potent in labor relations, and that is the psychology involved. I may sound like a professor standing here and talking to this body about psychology; but there is such a thing as psychology in human relations; and that is what we are dealing with in this particular instance. We are dealing with the relationship between management and labor. We are dealing with it, to be sure, on a colossal scale. I say that when by means of legal compulsion we try to bring about adjustments or settlements, or try to reach conclusions when there are disputes, we have chosen perhaps the worst vehicle which could be used for that purpose.

The point I wish to make most of all is that in the psychological aspect of the matter, labor itself would be very reluctant to create a condition which could bring a matter of this nature directly to the Congress, not for the Congress to settle, as has been indicated, but for the Congress to consider. The Congress would undertake to find a method of procedure by which a settlement could be reached.

Finally, Mr. President, I point out that in this particular instance the question is not in any way involved with the injunction. The next vote has nothing whatever to do with the injunction. We shall take that up when the time comes. The question before us, as the Senator from New York has previously stated, is a very simple one—whether the Senate prefers the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the provision in the Thomas bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. If this amendment is adopted or rejected, the substitute which I propose to the Thomas bill will then be in order; will it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless an additional amendment is offered to the Thomas bill, the next vote will occur on the Douglas-Aiken amendment to the Taft substitute for title III of the so-called Thomas substitute.

The question now is on the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the so-called Thomas substitute.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the delegation of the United States of America to the Second World Health Organization Assembly meeting at Rome, Italy.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of illness.

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

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "nay."

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the junior and senior Senators from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 67, as follows:

YEAS—15

Cain	Ives	McMahon
Frear	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Graham	Long	Thye
Hayden	McCarthy	Tobey
Hendrickson	McFarland	Young

NAYS—67

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Anderson	Hill	Mundt
Brewster	Hoey	Murray
Bricker	Holland	Myers
Bridges	Humphrey	Neely
Butler	Hunt	Pepper
Byrd	Jenner	Reed
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Sparkman
Donnell	Knowland	Taft
Douglas	Langer	Taylor
Downey	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McCarran	Tydings
Ferguson	McClellan	Vandenberg
Flanders	McGrath	Watkins
Fulbright	McKellar	Wherry
George	Magnuson	Williams
Gillette	Malone	Withers
Green	Martin	
Gurney	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—14

Baldwin	Miller	Stennis
Ecton	O'Conor	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Kem	Saltonstall	Wiley
Lodge	Smith, N. J.	

So Mr. IVES' amendment to the so-called Thomas substitute was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for himself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to the substitute to title 3 offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is now 20 minutes to 6. We have had two votes, and I doubt the advisability of taking up the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Vermont to the Taft substitute.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to offer an amendment, and have it printed, so that at the next session of the Senate it may be the pending question. It is an amendment to the Thomas bill, which I think from a parliamentary standpoint, if offered and called up, would have the right of way.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to that, and if the Senator desires to make that offer now, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the Thomas bill, proposed to title 3 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], dated May 31, 1949, to strike out from line 18 on page 32, through line 12 on page 34, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Amendment proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, viz: From title III of the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, dated May 31, 1949, strike out from line 18 on page 32 through line 12 on page 34, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Any emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President but not more than 30 days after the appointment of the board, make a report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"(c) An emergency board shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"(d) Members of an emergency board shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(e) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C. 19, title 15, secs. 49 and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

"(f) Each emergency board shall continue in existence after making its report for such time as the national emergency continues for

the purpose of mediating the dispute, should the parties request its services. When a board appointed under this section has been dissolved, its records shall be transferred to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"(g) A separate emergency board shall be appointed for each dispute. No member of an emergency board shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or in any employer involved in the dispute.

"PROCEDURE FOLLOWING PROCLAMATION

"SEC. 303. (a) At any time after issuing a proclamation pursuant to section 301 the President may submit to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make.

"(b) In any case in which a strike or lock-out occurs or continues after the issuance of the proclamation pursuant to section 301 the President shall submit immediately to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case, including the report of the emergency board if such report has been made, and such recommendations as he may see fit to make, including a recommendation that the United States take possession of and operate the business enterprise or enterprises involved in the dispute. If the President recommends that the United States shall take possession of and operate such enterprise or enterprises, the President shall have authority to take such action unless the Congress by concurrent resolution within 10 days after the submission of such recommendation to the Congress determines that such action should not be taken or enacts legislation designed to resolve the dispute and terminate the national emergency if Congress finds such an emergency exists: *Provided*, That during the period in which the United States shall have taken possession, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the emergency board shall continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the parties concerned, and the agency or department of the United States designated to operate such enterprise or enterprises shall have no authority to enter into negotiations with the employer or with any labor organization for a collective-bargaining contract or to alter the wages, hours, or the conditions of employment existing in such industry prior to the dispute, except in conformity with the recommendations of the emergency board or a concurrent resolution of the Congress. If the Congress or either House thereof shall have adjourned sine die or for a period longer than 3 days, the President shall convene the Congress, or such House for the purpose of consideration of and appropriate action pursuant to such statement and recommendations: *Provided further*, That the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes" (Norris-LaGuardia Act), approved March 24, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101–115), shall be applicable to the United States acting under the provisions of this title unless Congress by concurrent resolution provides otherwise in the particular case.

"SEC. 304. (a) In the event that the Government shall take possession of and operate any business enterprise or enterprises involved in a given dispute, the President shall designate the agency or department of Government which shall take possession of any business enterprise or enterprises including the properties thereof involved in the dispute and all other assets of the enterprise or enterprises necessary to such continued operation thereof as will protect the national health or safety.

"(b) Any enterprise or properties of which possession has been taken under this title shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as (1) such owners have reached an agreement with the representatives of the employees in such enterprise settling the issues in dispute between them, or (2) the President finds that the continued possession and operation of such enterprise by the United States is no longer necessary under the terms of the proclamation provided for in section 301: *Provided*, That possession by the United States shall be terminated not later than 60 days after the issuance of the report of the emergency board unless the period of possession is extended by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

"(c) During the period in which possession of any enterprise has been taken under this title, the United States shall hold all income received from the operation thereof in trust for the payment of general operating expenses, just compensation to the owners as hereinafter provided in this subsection, and reimbursement to the United States for expenses incurred by the United States in the operation of the enterprise. Any income remaining shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. In determining just compensation to the owners of the enterprise, due consideration shall be given to the fact that the United States took possession of such enterprise when its operation had been interrupted by a work stoppage or that a work stoppage was imminent; to the fact that the owners or the labor organization, as the case may be, have failed or refused to comply with the recommendations of the emergency board or the conditions determined by the Congress to constitute a just settlement of the dispute; to the fact that the United States would have returned such enterprise to its owners at any time when an agreement was reached settling the issues involved in such work stoppage; and to the value the use of such enterprise would have had to its owners in the light of the labor dispute prevailing, had they remained in possession during the period of Government operation.

"(d) Whenever any enterprise is in the possession of the United States under this section, it shall be the duty of any labor organization of which any employees who have been employed in the operation of such enterprise are members, and of the officers of such labor organization, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to refrain from a stoppage of work and not to engage in any strike, slow-down, or other concerted refusal to work, or stoppage of work, and if such stoppage of work has occurred, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to return to work and not to engage in any strike, slow-down, or other concerted refusal to work or stoppage of work while such enterprise is in the possession of the United States.

"(e) During the period in which possession of any enterprise has been taken by the United States under this section, the employer or employees or their duly designated representatives and the representatives of the employees in such enterprise shall be obligated to continue collective bargaining for the purpose of settling the issues in the dispute between them.

"(f) (1) The President may appoint a compensation board to determine the amount to be paid as just compensation under this section to the owner of any enterprise of which possession is taken. For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any such board the provisions relating to the conduct of hearings or inquiries by emergency boards as provided in section 302 of this title are hereby made applicable to any such hearing or inquiry. The members of compensation boards shall be appointed and compensated in accordance with the provisions of section 302 of this title.

"(2) Upon appointing such compensation board the President shall make provision as may be necessary for stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the compensation board to perform its functions.

"(3) The award of the compensation board shall be final and binding upon the parties, unless within 30 days after the issuance of said award, either party moves to have the said award set aside or modified in the United States Court of Claims in accordance with the rules of said court.

"SEC. 305. When a dispute arising under this title has been finally settled, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of all the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make.

"SEC. 306. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any matter which is subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say only this, that the language of the amendment is identical with the Morse amendment which is printed and already on the desks of Senators, save and except that it strikes therefrom section 301 and section 302 (a). It also changes, on page 6, line 10, of the Morse amendment, the language, "the continued normal operation thereof." That is stricken and in lieu thereof the following language is inserted: "Such continued operation thereof as will protect the national health or safety." Otherwise, the amendment as just offered is identical with the previous Morse amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator offering the amendment at this time?

Mr. MORSE. I offer the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will make it the pending question. It will take precedence over other pending amendments, inasmuch as it is offered to the text of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask the distinguished occupant of the chair to state once again the pending question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment just offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. That is the pending amendment. It is an amendment to the original text of the bill, and therefore takes precedence over other amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Vice President. I think some of the Senators were rather confused. We could not hear, and I appreciate very much the announcement by the Chair.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive P, Eighty-first Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and Costa Rica for the establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, signed at Washington May 31, 1949. Without objection,

the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be read. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's message was read, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a convention between the United States of America and Costa Rica for the establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, signed at Washington May 31, 1949.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report which the Acting Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to this convention.

The purpose of this convention has my approval and I recommend the convention to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 22, 1949.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report by the Acting Secretary of State; (2) Convention for the establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, Washington, May 31, 1949.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

W. Walton Butterworth, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of State;

John D. Hickerson, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of State;

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of State;

Edward G. Miller, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of State;

George W. Perkins, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of State;

George F. Kennan, of Wisconsin, to be Counselor of the Department of State;

Adrian S. Fisher, of Tennessee, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State;

Nathaniel P. Davis, of New Jersey, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Costa Rica, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Hungary;

Joseph Flack, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Bolivia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Costa Rica;

George P. Shaw, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador;

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uruguay, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Czechoslovakia;

Christian M. Ravndal, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uruguay, and

The nominations of John Wesley Jones, of Iowa, and several other routine appointments in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Edward H. Davidson, of New Jersey, to be Director of Locomotive Inspection;

Joseph A. Kerrins, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the United States Coast Guard; and

James E. Fleming, Edward J. Johnson, and Carleton W. Wahl, officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Sam M. Wear to be United States attorney for the western district of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Oscar Kent La Roque to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 23, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 22 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John Campbell Ausland, of Pennsylvania.
John H. Barber, of California.
Vincent R. Boening, of Michigan.
William B. Buffum, of New York.
Miss Patricia M. Byrne, of Ohio.
Peter R. Chase, of Massachusetts.
Thomas R. Craig, Jr., of West Virginia.
Richard T. Ewing, of Maryland.
Seymour H. Glazer, of Louisiana.
Philip C. Habib, of California.
James E. Hewes, Jr., of Connecticut.
James L. Houghteling, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Miss M. Louise Kirby, of Wyoming.
Cleo A. Noel, Jr., of Missouri.
Harry B. Pangburn, of Texas.
Paul O. Proehl, of Illinois.
Barrett M. Reed, of New York.
John F. Rogers, of Hawaii.
Mrs. Corey B. Sanderson, of Idaho.
Robert Simpson, of New York.
Herbert B. Thompson, of California.
Edward J. Thrasher, of New York.
Viron P. Vaky, of Texas.
Wendell W. Woodbury, of Iowa.
Charles G. Wootton, of Connecticut.

JUDGE, UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Morgan Ford, of North Dakota, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. William J. Tilson, deceased.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Clifton C. Carter, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas, vice M. Frank Hammond, retired.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harry M. Durning, of New York, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y. (Reappointment.)

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

Adams, Harry Jones, AO50547.
*Arave, William Lloyd, AO50553.
Bassett, John Kenneth, AO56750.
*Boehm, Paul Francis, AO50551.
Briggs, Richard Carlson, AO56758.
Bunge, Howard Thomas, AO50558.
Davis, Homer Sims, AO50544.
Dillard, George Edward, AO56740.
Dingeldein, Robert, AO56757.
Edge, Robert Laneer, AO56754.
Everette, John Bernard, AO56749.
Fox, George Arthur, AO56751.
*Gaines, Edmund Pendleton, Jr., AO50555.
Garlington, Arthur Roe, Jr., AO50552.
Hallenbeck, Alva Merle, AO50560.
Harris, Roy Lee, Jr., AO50556.
Hartzell, Richard Atley, AO56743.
Howell, Philip Vann, Jr., AO56734.
Hudlow, Richard Jolly, AO56745.
Krieger, Thomas Bert, AO50546.
Latshaw, Robert Thomas, Jr., AO56746.
Leuchtmann, Robert Louis, AO56752.
Like, Delbert Odell, AO56744.
*Murrell, James Edward, AO41360.
*Peebles, Thomas Nathaniel, AO50548.
Ricketts, James Ellsworth, Jr., AO50550.
Sadler, Robert Edward, AO50557.
Sanders, Stephen John, AO50543.
Steorts, Ward Arnold, AO56738.
Turner, Joseph Harry, AO50545.
*Vidmer, Julian Richards, Jr., AO56742.
Warren, Foster Gage, Jr., AO56756.
White, Charles Reuben, AO56733.
Yeager, Randall Gerald, Jr., AO56747.

NOTE.—These officers will complete the required 3 years' service for promotion during the months of July, August, and September. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 22 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Oscar Kent La Roque, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1953.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Sam M. Wear, to be United States attorney for the western district of Missouri.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O infinite God, Thou who dost care for the suns and stars, we praise Thee that Thou dost have time and thought for the children of earth. Thy goodness accompanies us day by day, and upon us Thou dost pour out Thy blessings of abundance.

In humbleness of heart we ask for another opportunity to work, for blessed are they who take their places in the councils of a nation and seek to serve unselfishly and even sacrificially. Whatever we do this day as selected lawmakers of the land, may we do it in the spirit of consecration to the needs and welfare of all the people.

Richly bless and guide the Speaker and the Congress this day. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 263. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Orange, Calif., a perpetual easement for the maintenance and operation of a public highway, and to grant to the Irvine Co., a corporation, a perpetual easement for the maintenance, operation, and use of a water pipe line, in the vicinity of the naval air base, Santa Ana, Orange County, Calif.;

H. R. 593. An act for the relief of Hampton Institute;

H. R. 650. An act for the relief of George A. Kirchberger;

H. R. 716. An act for the relief of Mark H. Potter;

H. R. 717. An act for the relief of Groover O'Connell;

H. R. 735. An act for the relief of Phil H. Hubbard;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Linzay;

H. R. 1123. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mayfield;

H. R. 1125. An act for the relief of Ellis C. Wagner and Barbara P. Wagner;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of June C. Dollar;

H. R. 1771. An act relating to loans by Federal agencies for the construction of certain public works;

H. R. 1837. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 1858. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John Waipa Wilson;

H. R. 1981. An act for the relief of V. O. McMillan and the legal guardian of Carolyn McMillan;

H. R. 2078. An act for the relief of Winston A. Brownie;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of Joel W. Atkinson;

H. R. 3311. An act for the relief of Carmen Morales, Aida Morales, and Lydia Cortes;

H. R. 3324. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Anastacio Acosta, and the estate of Domingo Acosta Arizmendi;

H. R. 3444. An act to provide for the collection and publication of cotton statistics;

H. R. 3603. An act for the relief of Michael Palazotta;

H. R. 3992. An act for the relief of J. L. Hitt;

H. R. 4332. An act to amend the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4471. An act to regulate the hours of duty and the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard;

H. R. 4516. An act to amend section 312 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for the retention of certain officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Navy; and

H. J. Res. 276. Joint resolution granting certain extensions of time for tax purposes.

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. 750. An act for the relief of Lee F. Bertuccioli;

H. R. 781. An act to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 834. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2282. An act to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of Sadae Aoki;

H. R. 2859. An act to authorize the sale of public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 3198. An act to amend the act of June 18, 1929; and

H. R. 3458. An act for the relief of Celeste Iris Maeda.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 115. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes;

S. 230. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sonia Kaye Johnston;

S. 447. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to regulate the transportation, packing, marking, and description of explosives and other dangerous articles;

S. 471. An act for the relief of Lloyd Gordon Findley and Malcolm Hearne Findley, a minor;

S. 509. An act to provide for the advancement of Commissioned Warrant Officer Chester A. Davis, United States Marine Corps (retired) to the rank of lieutenant colonel on the retired list;

S. 622. An act for the relief of Isaiah Johnson;

S. 771. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

S. 803. An act to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the State of Maryland for use as a site for a National Guard armory and for training the National Guard or for other military purposes;

S. 897. An act for the relief of William Henry Tickner;

S. 974. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to certain mothers of veterans;

S. 980. An act for the relief of Toshie Okutomi;

S. 1003. An act for the relief of Emory T. Wales;

S. 1076. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended;

S. 1278. An act to fix the United States share of project costs, under the Federal Airport Act, involved in installation of high intensity lighting on CAA designated instrument landing runways;

S. 1279. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to provide that minimum rates of wages need be specified only in contracts in excess of $2,000;

S. 1280. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to limit to 10 percent any increase of the amount stated as a maximum obligation under a grant agreement;

S. 1283. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in, or in close proximity to, national parks, monuments, and recreation areas, and for other purposes;

S. 1285. An act to authorize progressive partial payments to sponsors under the Federal Airport Act program;

S. 1359. An act to repeal the provisions of the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and sections 91 to 107 of the Canal Zone Code and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such provisions are applicable;

S. 1405. An act to provide for the admission to, and the permanent residence in, the United States of Poon Lim;

S. 1429. An act for the relief of Lacey C. Zapf;

S. 1507. An act to amend section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946, relating to the receipt of pay, allowances, or other expenses while drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay, and for other purposes;

S. 1560. An act to authorize the appointment of Col. Kenneth D. Nichols, O-17498, professor of the United States Military Academy in the permanent grade of colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1578. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to proceed with the construction of stations of the Alaska Communication System;

S. 1639. An act to amend section 1452, Revised Statutes, relating to Presidential action on the proceedings and decisions of Navy retiring boards;

S. 1688. An act to provide for certain adjustments on the promotion list of the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army;

S. 1977. An act to extend the time within which legislative employees may come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act;

S. 2010. An act to extend for 2 years the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs respecting leases and leased property;

S. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended;

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1089. An act to amend section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, relating to

marketing agreements and orders, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue orders under such section with respect to filberts.

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. 3082. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, 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. HILL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. HUNT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. REED, and Mr. SALTONSTALL 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. 3751. An act to transfer a tower located on the Lower Souris National Wildlife Refuge to the International Peace Garden, Inc., N. Dak.

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. MCFARLAND, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado 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. 4754. An act to simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, to reorganize certain agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

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. MCCLELLAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HOEY, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. IVES 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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4392) entitled "An act to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States No. 49-15.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was granted permission under unanimous-consent request to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by General Sarnoff on the subject of man and science. I have been informed by the Public Printer that the article will run one-third of a page over the maximum limit and will cost $175. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the additional cost, that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Journal entitled "Are the Nation's Schools in for a Witch Hunt?"

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

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. PETERSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2989) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Comporation, and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3082) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appointes the following conferees: Messrs. BATES of Kentucky, YATES, FURCOLO, CANNON, CHURCH, and STOCKMAN.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 257 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4009) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, the rule making the housing bill in order is an open rule which will give every Member an opportunity to express his views and offer amendments when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule. Furthermore it provides for 8 hours general debate—eight long hours.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House many years. Never before have I witnessed such a unanimous plea and demand for legislation as I have observed and has come to me, as I think to most of the Members with reference to this bill.

Forty-two of the governors have endorsed this legislation. The United States conference of mayors advocates this bill. All veteran and all labor, church, and civic groups favor this program. Without unduly encumbering the RECORD I insert the names of a few other organizations supporting this needed legislation:

The League of Women Voters.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Association of Parents and Teachers.
National Urban League.
National Association of Rural Housing.
National Farmers Union.

American Municipal Association.
American Council on Education.
American Home Economics Association.
National Association of Municipal Law Officers.
National Federation of Settlements.
American Council on Human Rights.
Family Service Association of America.
National Grange.

The other body passed a similar bill three times. The last one is now before us. Due to the unholy coalition and alliance in this House, this bill which is so sadly needed by the millions of homeless has not been favorably acted upon. For weeks—yes, for years—the real-estate lobby, bankers, loan associations, builders, and developers have spent millions of dollars, time, and effort to misinform the public, and the membership of this House. They have issued weekly statements all extremely unwarranted and unjustifiable—yes, even untrue and false in many instances. Also, through the press and radio and on the public platforms using every media of communication, in order to prejudice the minds of the Members, and have even influenced some Members here, to assert that this bill will cost between $16,000,000,000 and $20,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, in compliance with the suggestion of some of the members of the Committee on Rules, as chairman of that committee, I submitted a request to Frank Pace, Jr., the Director of the Budget, asking for information and propounding written interrogatories that were submitted to me in a statement prepared by one of the Republican members of the Committee on Rules. I have in my hand the Budget Director's reply and I regret exceedingly that I do not have the time to read the entire letter, but I will quote a few extracts from it, as follows:

In fact, as I have already stated, the maximum annual authorizations of $400,000,000, although necessary to insure private financing at the lowest cost, would not be paid either for the maximum number of years or at the maximum annual rate. A reasonable estimate of the total amount required over the life of the program would be $9,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000, rather than $16,000,000,000.

If these amounts are discounted at the same 2-percent-interest rate employed in the example in your letter, the present value of the probable Federal contributions would not be $11,300,000,000 as your example indicates, but roughly $7,000,000,000. If discounted at the more appropriate long-term rate of 2½ percent, the present value of the probable Federal contributions would be roughly $6,500,000,000.

Thus, as indicated above, the basic premise of your question that Federal subsidies for low-rent housing [would] exceed by a considerable margin the entire construction costs of such housing, is in error. One reason why this legislation is in accord with the program of the President is that the method provided for financing the low-rent housing program would result in substantially lower costs to the Federal Government than would be required by direct Federal construction.

I feel you owe it to yourselves to read the entire letter in the Appendix of the RECORD which I inserted on June 8. It can be found on page A3585. If you will read his statement, and you know he is a man with a splendid reputation, and trustworthy in every respect, it will prove that the figures of the opposition were used to prejudice the minds of the members and were untrue and unwarranted. This report from the Director of the Budget will clearly substantiate my remarks made from the very outset with respect to this legislation and also the recent statement of President Truman, to the effect that the figures as given by the opposition are unreliable and in fact untrue.

The Director of the Budget makes clear that the cost will not be more than nine or ten billion dollars. With the agreement on the part of the Committee on Banking and Currency to reduce the number of housing units by 25 percent—from 1,050,000 to 810,000, the cost will be still further reduced, so that it will not entail more than seven and one-half or eight billion dollars—and that sum covers a period of 40 years. That would be even less than $200,000,000 a year. Compare that amount with the appropriations we have made in the last 10 years for agriculture, in which every rural section of our country has been benefited. Bear in mind that in the last 10 years we have appropriated on an average of $1,500,000,000 every year, for agriculture, which amounts to almost 10 times as much as this bill calls for annually.

Another outrageous and propagandic attack on the part of the opponents of this legislation is, that only 10 States will be benefited. Again, that is clearly an untrue statement. The fact is that 46 States will be benefited. They have passed enabling legislation to take advantage of this program. But even if the charge were true, I wish to point out that the 10 States have contributed to the Treasury of our country annually, 65 or 66 percent of all the revenue. To verify my statement at this point, I insert herewith excerpts from the official Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue, report, as follows:

Total internal revenue collections for year ending June 30, 1948

	Percent of total revenue
New York, $7,975,513,000	19.05
Illinois, $3,785,815,000	9.04
Pennsylvania, $3,222,789,000	7.70
California, $3,103,679,000	7.41
Ohio, $2,665,707,000	6.37
Massachusetts $1,347,084,000	3.22
Michigan, $2,252,280,000	5.38
New Jersey, $1,272,223,000	3.04
North Carolina, $1,238,661,000	2.93
Indiana, $1,011,921,000	2.4
Total for 10 States	65.57

Total collected in United States, $41,864,542,000.

Although the charge that only a few States will benefit, is ridiculous, nevertheless, because of their large contributions to the Treasury, these States would be entitled to receive benefits provided under this bill. But I am not going to base my request for favorable action on the bill on that score, because I feel that by this time you are all satisfied that this is a meritorious bill and is urgently needed.

I hope that you Members will be guided by your conscience, not by created prejudice, and will vote for this rule and for this greatly needed legislation which will relieve millions of unfortunate veterans and other homeless people who are living in shacks, trailer camps, tents, doubled up with their relatives and friends, and under other deplorable conditions such as this country, the richest country in the world, should not permit or tolerate. Oh, we appropriate millions to help build homes for those of other lands in devastated countries, even those of our former enemies. Why should we hesitate or refuse to appropriate moneys necessary to obtain decent homes for our own citizens?

Why refuse to appropriate one-tenth or one-twentieth of the amount we have provided for the rural and farming sections of this country, on behalf of our own needy and deserving American citizens living in urban communities who are appealing to you for relief from the intolerable conditions under which they must continue to live until relief is forthcoming.

Some people say this legislation will affect private enterprise. That is all wrong. It will aid private enterprise; furthermore, private enterprise has promised to build homes; it has made that promise for the past 9 or 10 years. Has it built these homes for the low-income people? Indeed not. Private enterprise has built homes for those who could pay twelve, fifteen, and twenty thousand dollars, but not for those who could afford to pay only seven or eight.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. When the gentleman states that this will aid private industry in the building of homes I call attention to the fact that in 1935 when we were considering the Social Security Act—and I was on the subcommittee that drafted it—the cry was made in relation to old-age and survivors insurance that it would destroy the private insurance companies. As a matter of fact it has greatly increased the business of private insurance companies. These companies now admit that they were wrong and that it has been of great benefit to them because it has got the American people insurance-minded, and the number of policies has increased many millions; it has been an inspiration. This bill will have the same effect on private industry. Low-cost housing and slum clearance is a field which would not affect the building of one- and two-family houses at all. Furthermore, the research provisions will prove beneficial to private industry.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Massachusetts is a well-informed Member and I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will the majority leader explain why, if this will be

of such benefit to private industry, that private industry is 100 percent against the bill?

Mr. SABATH. Because of avarice on the part of many of those in private industry who are out only to make money and more money, who have no conception of the duty they owe to the country or to those people who should be given the opportunity to obtain decent housing.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield, the answer to the inquiry is the experience of the insurance companies under the social security law. They admit now that they were wrong. They honestly entertained a position of opposition because they were afraid; but experience has shown they were wrong, and they have admitted it long since. They realize that especially the old-age and survivors insurance provision has been of great benefit to them.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does the gentleman by that statement mean to say that private industry does not know what they should do or what is best for them?

Mr. McCORMACK. My position is that most of them are honest in their opposition. I am not going to impugn the motive of anyone.

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

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield further.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, if the gentleman cannot yield for a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. 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. 111]

Bailey	Hall, Leonard W.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bentsen	Harden	Phillips, Calif.
Boggs, Del.	Herlong	Plumley
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Poulson
Breen	Jackson, Calif.	Powell
Buckley, N. Y.	Jacobs	Short
Bulwinkle	Jennings	Stockman
Burke	Kearney	Taber
Carroll	Kee	Taylor
Case, S. Dak.	King	Thomas, N. J.
Chatham	Latham	Velde
Clevenger	Lichtenwalter	Vursell
Cole, N. Y.	McMillen, Ill.	Wadsworth
Crawford	Macy	White, Idaho
Gilmer	Miller, Nebr.	Wier
Gore	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Granger	Murphy	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Konski	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 374 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, at the time that the point of no quorum was made I was about to reserve the balance of my time. I had concluded my remarks. I yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts realizing that I did not have any more time for myself.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and yield 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in opposing the housing bill I am swayed not entirely by the content of the measure, although there is much that could be singled out for criticism. My opposition is chiefly due to a profound conviction we cannot afford to engage in this new enterprise in which so few will benefit at the peril of so many.

It is not my purpose to delve into the past but to consider the present with a firm hope we can avert a collapse in the years immediately ahead.

Let us pause for a moment and examine our financial condition. We find we owe $252,000,000,000 in our national debt. That is about $1,800 for every individual in the United States. Think of it. We owe $1,800 for every man, woman, and child in this country. This stupendous national debt represents a hidden mortgage of $6,026.55 on every home in America. We can readily understand the concern which would be visible if the responsibility for that debt was assumed by the individual. But the responsibility, while not assumed, is there. And if it is not paid the individual and the home owner alike will suffer.

No one can successfully dispute that this country is in a grave financial crisis. We are spending in excess of our national income. The deficit spending will be even greater next year as a declining business economy yields less taxes. What are we going to do about it? What course shall we pursue?

We can go on spending dangerously, starting new expenditures in response to the pressure groups and piling up an even bigger national debt; or we can substantially increase taxes in a vain effort to achieve a balanced budget; or we can cut down the spending. These are the alternatives. There are no others. For me the choice is plain—I shall try to reduce the spending.

Most everybody recognizes to start deficit financing when the Federal debt is $252,000,000,000 is extremely perilous. It could destroy confidence in the value of the dollar; it could start a flight away from the dollar to commodities with a consequence of rising prices and a wilder inflation than we have yet experienced. We must not take this chance. It is what the Communists would like very much to see us do. Then they could take over without firing a single shot.

We could, of course, increase taxes as recommended by the President. But this, in my opinion, would not do the job. Increased taxes do not necessarily mean increased revenue. Increased taxes, when we are trying to head off a depression, would be unwise. It could, and probably would, be fatal to many small industries. It would dry up the funds needed for expansion and research. It would make it impossible for some concerns to carry workers through the depressed period. It might easily produce less rather than more revenue.

The remaining alternative is to cut down the spending. This will not be popular. My experience is that many people like to talk about economy and that is about all. They have no real, unselfish will to bring about economy. They are naturally for economy when it affects something in which they have no great interest or any particular benefit. But when it affects them personally they find ready excuses for abandoning economy. We cannot come safely through this crisis with selfishness.

The present need is to eliminate waste and useless spending in Government. We must work and we must produce. It is the only safe way. It is the way back to a sound Government and a bright tomorrow.

It is not time for new Government ventures involving vast sums of money. All may have worthy objectives. Some of them might be highly desirable if we had the money to pay the bills. But the Government has no available money; it has only the money that it assesses upon you and me and the other 140,000,000 of Americans. The people must pay for these bills. They pay them through toil and sweat. And in my judgment the people are waking up as they get their tax bills from the city, county, State, and National Governments. Nearly one-third of every earned dollar goes to pay for the services of Government. To push the assessments higher might well destroy popular Government as we know it. That, I do not want to happen.

As we multiply the demands upon the national Government we steadily increase the size of our bureaucracy and the number of Federal jobholders who must be carried upon the backs of the American producers—whether they be workers, farmers, or tradesmen. Already the bureaucracy has become so large, so autocratic and arrogant that it threatens to destroy this free way of life.

No, every ounce of common sense cries out against the further encroachment of the Federal bureaucracy into the lives of our people.

To keep freedom and individual initiative requires some sacrifice; it means going without some things that might be desirable. There is nothing more precious on this earth than freedom. It is worth sacrifice.

For a moment let us consider the bill we are asked to support. It could cost between sixteen and nineteen billions of dollars in the period of its lifetime. That is a heavy obligation to assume in the face of a possible financial collapse. Less than 6 percent of our people would be in the class available to benefit by the legislation, and less than 7 percent of those available could be selected. In other words, out of every 1,000 people you know, only 4 could qualify. The limitation placed in the bill provides for those four. The other 996 persons will get nothing but increased tax bills. So few to be benefited to imperil so many.

Those selected must expect to pay $50 or $60 per month in addition to the Government contribution. No one unable to pay $50 could qualify. The Government

subsidy would bring it down to this rental. People able to pay $50 a month rent should find little difficulty in getting a home, built by private enterprise. It is the group who cannot afford to pay half that rent we should worry about. There is no relief in this bill for them.

Undoubtedly there are some remaining hardship cases, but the slack is being rapidly taken up. It will not be long before it will be a problem what to do with some of the available houses.

The big rush to marry following the war is over. Marriages reached the peak of 2,291,000 in 1946; in 1947 they dropped to 1,992,000; and in 1948 they reached 1,815,000; and this year the estimated number of marriages is 1,600,000.

In addition, in a declining business economy we find families contracting. They take a smaller apartment, and in many instances they double up. The reverse, of course, was true in expanding business; and this was responsible, in part, for the unprecedented housing demand. There was lots of money available, and we all like to live as well as we can afford.

Private enterprise, if encouraged, will lick this problem and provide decent homes without breaking financially either the Federal or local governments. In 1946 under Federal control and supervision, 460,000 houses were constructed; in 1947 with Government encouragement 840,000 houses were built; and in 1948, 960,000. This year the threat of Government competition will force down the new units to be constructed somewhat below the last 2 years. In fairness it may be added that there is also a slackening in the pressure.

May I add there are complaints about the costs of State and city governments. Some cities and towns in my State are paying tax rates of $55 and $60 a thousand. Is it right to put tax-free houses along side of these? Is it right to ask these struggling property owners to help pay the rent of people who can live in houses commanding a larger rent than they do? Is it right for our hard-working farmers and factory employees to help pay the rent of people with larger incomes? Is it right to further imperil the financial stability of cities and States by offering them "easy money"? After all, this program will cost the local governments at least $6,000,000,000. That is if we do not juggle the legislation.

There is in the bill a sop to the farmers. Less than 50,000 could possibly share. The Secretary of Agriculture could give an outright grant to $500 to a man with one farm building or $1,000 if he has two buildings. Then there could be a loan of $1,000 on easy interest terms. Only a handful of farmers in the North and West and precious few in the South could meet the requirements of the bill. The best you can say about this feature of the bill is that it is based upon good intentions. The average farm dweller has about as much chance in sharing in this shower of Federal money as a listener to hit the jack pot in the Stop the Music program.

We all have a natural concern for clearance of the slums in the big cities of our country. They are menaces and a threat to our national health. These slums should and must be cleaned up. And the Federal Government will be obliged to aid or else the job will not be done. Communities are reluctant to clean up their own messes. Yet they must not be allowed to step out of an obligation which primarily belongs to them. After all, slums are man-made. They occur chiefly because of a laxity on the part of city authorities. Landlords are permitted to exact rentals from the poor people and then are not obliged to keep up their property. Here is where should come the first step in the needed reform. Cities should be required through ordinances similar to those in Baltimore to take the initial step in slum clearance. It is remarkable how much can be done. Old, unsightly buildings can be repaired, renovated, and remodeled. They could be made in some instances better than new homes. One need only point to what has been accomplished in Georgetown in the Nation's Capital. The job can and must be done, but it can only be effective through the driving force of local public opinion.

There is another side of the slum-clearance picture, too, we must consider. How enormous will be the job? We should know the whole story before departing upon a venture that could be overwhelming.

I am afraid from my own observations that some of the veterans' housing that has been constructed under Government supervision will last only a short time. A few years hence there well may be suburban slums that we will be asked and with direct obligations to clean up because we put them there. The whole problem is one that must be thought through.

If this program is adopted as reported, I predict there will be less housing and housing will cost more. Private home owners will not build in competition with Government. They will sit back and wait until later expanded programs give them a house. It will cost more because as the Government comes in with the heavy purchases prices will increase.

We, in this country today, face a greater potential danger than at any time in our history. Yes, the danger is greater than when Hitler was marching through France and threatening to dominate the world.

Today every country in Europe outside of Russia is weak in a military and economic sense. Russia holds most of Asia with its countless millions of people in its grasp. Communism reaches out to force its deadly and destructive ideology upon free people everywhere.

Here in America is the only strong country physically and financially able to combat the march of communism. Yet we too are weakened from the long and costly struggle of World War II and our efforts to rebuild the world.

We have a national debt of $252,000,000,000; our cost of Government is over $42,000,000,000; we are groaning under heavy taxes of city, State, and Nation. All this at the time of a declining business.

There is only one chance for America and free people in every part of the globe. We must keep this country strong and solvent; to do this we must forego some of the things we would like to do. To help a few people we cannot imperil the Nation.

Let us make this Nation one of self-respecting home owners rather than a nation of subsidized tenants in Government projects. Let us remain a free people.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the counsel that I now bring my colleagues comes from an old and devoted friend, and is given in the spirit in which one brother would counsel with another concerning matters of profound concern to the welfare of the entire family.

We are here being called upon to make a decision that is of greater far-reaching effect than has been realized—a decision for which we shall either be praised or condemned by the generations that will follow us. Mr. Speaker, I have no illusions about my strength to stay the whirlwind of destruction that I see approaching, but I must make the attempt, feeble thought it may be.

The greater part of my official life has been spent in the midst of revolution, peaceful though it has been, but revolution nonetheless. And because I am not a revolutionist I have not courted nor have I received the plaudits of the multitude. I bear scars, not medals.

Mr. Speaker, it is my reverence for the genius of the founding fathers and the American institutions built under the inspiration they gave that has made the welfare of my country my chief concern, and, when necessary to hold true to this principle, I have sacrificed favoritism and personal attachment and refused to bend to the pull of selfish interests.

Mr. Speaker, do not all signs indicate that we are running into serious trouble? And if these signs are correct should we not show a greater understanding of the realities than is here reflected? Do we not owe the people a better responsibility than is here disclosed? Should we not marshall the strength of the Nation for the task that lies ahead rather than dissipate it through political revelry and insane irresponsibility?

I fear this new philosophy that threatens to sweep us away from the moorings of the Constitution. From a government of distributed powers I have seen develop a virtual concentration of all power. Rights reserved to the States and to the people are no longer respected. The order of things has been reversed. Government now exists as the master of the people and undertakes to support them, rather than as their servant to be supported by them.

This measure that we are asked to consider does not seek to lure our people to the acceptance of socialism. It does not seek to entice us into the acceptance of a totalitarian economy. There is nothing deceptive about it. This bill plainly, openly, and boldly declares socialism to be our new national policy. For if language is not intended to deceive, then that is the only meaning that can be gathered from the text of the bill and the report that accompanies it.

In this bill it is proposed that we legislatively declare this scheme of totalitarian or authoritatian bureaucracy to be essential to the health of our national economy. Here the Republic is cast adrift upon the treacherous sea of socialism. Here caution and moderation, reason and sanity, are thrown to the winds. Here Government domination and political control are fastened upon the American home with the assurance that complete statism soon will follow.

Mr. Speaker, this is no makeshift, temporary, emergency proposal. This is a permanent part of the new socialist economy to be ushered in by an over-all housing activity with continuing, expanded, and extended Federal financing.

The almost unlimited, ramifying activities and powers provided in this measure challenge the imagination, yet at the same time leave little to uncertainty. You will find them variously enumerated throughout the bill. They are too numerous for me to recite. They are in part as follows:

The elimination of slums and blighted areas; the development and the redevelopment of communities (whether or not such communities want to be redeveloped, uprooted, and uplifted); adequate housing for all who now are inadequately housed; the appraising of housing activities and progress; the general welfare and security of the Nation; a decent home and a suitable living environment for every family; the stability of the home-building industry and its full contribution to an economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power; the production of lower-cost housing of good quality; a directive to the administrative agencies of the Federal Government to exercise all powers, functions, and duties with respect to housing (as if they needed such directive); the production of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life; the use of new designs, materials, techniques, and methods; the use of standardized dimensions and methods of assembly; the increase of efficiency; the development of well-planned, integrated neighborhoods; the establishment of the housing industry at a high annual level of construction; plans for land uses, density, and other factors; the making of loans and capital grants; furnishing technical assistance; assuring compliance with statutory requirements; acquiring, clearing, and preparing sites for appropriate reuse; the absorption of losses; the dispersion or displacement of all persons now living in slums or blighted areas and their relocation; and the financing of schools and other public utilities.

Will you contend that such a program does not constitute a Socialist economy? Does it not possess all the patois of the party line? What do you think necessary to complete it? Free bread and free circuses? But do we not already provide an abundance of free bread? Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, this is a colossal socialistic departure. It expands the limited and restricted program we enacted some years ago. It serves to demonstrate strikingly and eloquently the limitless cupidity of bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, we are told here categorically: "There is little disagreement that housing constitutes one of the Nation's most serious economic and social problems." This housing shortage, it is stated, "results from the fact that over the years we have never been able to produce enough housing at prices which a large proportion of the American people can afford, and many families have been obliged to live in wholly inadequate and unsuitable accommodations."

But that tells us nothing, Mr. Speaker. Certainly it does not tell us why we have not been able to produce enough housing at prices which a large proportion of the American people can afford. But I can tell you why. You can find the reason in the history of America. You can find it in the spirit and the genius of private American industry. You can find it in the toil, the sacrifice, and the thrift of our people from earliest colonial days until we began the propaganda of a paternalistic government fashioned upon the design of free grants and free subsidies in every aspect of our national life. When, Mr. Speaker, did home building and home ownership become the function of the Federal Government? As I read our history, home ownership always has been a most fundamental, a most basic, private enterprise. That always has been true even in the rental of homes. But here we would make the Federal Government the landlord.

If there is a housing shortage in America today, I believe it is because the private home-building industry of the Nation is hindered and retarded by frustrating codes and jurisdictional disputes, and feather-bedding. I believe that the real remedy lies not in the creation of a new order of subsidies and grants, but in removing from private industry the fetters that now bind it.

Is not it just about time that at least we, Members of the Congress, began to see with clearer vision? Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we know better, or at least we should. Have not we now gone so far in this scheme of Federal grants and subsidies as to create in the minds of our people a vast, limitless hoard of ready cash here at Washington to be had but for the asking? Have we not created the phantasy of a money-making Federal Government rolling in wealth to be dispersed with lavish hand? Well, we are making paper money. We are making all kinds of paper wealth. And it is depreciating with every new issue. At our present socialistic rate we soon shall be forced to make it in bales and haul it about in wheelbarrows.

Under this scheme of statism a public housing administrator is given blanket authority to "have outstanding at any one time" $1,000,000,000 worth of obligations to be issued in such amounts as he may determine. Those obligations are to be purchased by the Treasury. Is that anything more than swapping paper?

How long, Mr. Speaker, can such a scheme endure? That is not wealth. Government cannot create wealth. The history of governmental finance bears eloquent testimony to that. There is no vast repository of cash here at Washington from which an endless, never-ceasing stream of real dollars can flow. Real dollars, real wealth, can be created only by industry and toil and thrift. Our national wealth has been created by a free industrial enterprise and millions upon millions of individual home builders, home owners, and homemakers.

Mr. Speaker, I find it increasingly difficult to believe that there is not an abundance of funds at lower levels for the purpose of home building. All our States are almost without debt. Many of them have lendable surpluses. Almost every bank in the Nation—from the smallest to the largest—has funds available for loans to home builders. Our great private lending institutions have abundant funds available for this purpose. Yet, I should be willing to support the lending provisions of this measure. We should not go further than provide credits for people who want to build their own homes. Rural and small town people who support this proposal upon the theory that these is something of benefit in it for them will come to a sad awakening when they realize that of the more than nineteen and one-half billions of dollars that must be taxed out of all the people, there will be less than one-half of 1 percent that they will stand the remotest chance of getting. The whole thing is a colossal fraud, and if adopted will wreck the economy of the country.

I question not the motives of those who immediately bring this proposal before us. My opposition is based upon fear—upon fear of the ultimate consequences of such a violent departure from our traditional way of life. Would that we might profit from the history of the Republic. Even more so from the history of other states and other peoples. Certainly my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, will not plead ignorance of the history of Egyptian bureaucrats. Has he forgotten the story of how they compelled the people to cry out to Moses for relief? They, too, dominated the building industry. But they dominated the people even more. They lashed the people; they imposed burdensome tasks upon the people; they exacted toil and sweat, and bricks without straw. And they drove his people from the land to seek refuge in the wilderness.

This bill, if enacted into law, will create a colossal bureaucracy. Bureaucrats will overrun our land, too. They will devour the people's sustenance. They will confiscate the people's wealth. They will impose onerous and burdensome tasks upon all of us. They will drive our people, too, into a wilderness—a wilderness of despair.

With great apprehension have I observed our progress during recent years, Mr. Speaker. You know that. Time and again have I been constrained to lift my voice against our progressive advance into a socialist state. Now we are here asked to declare a national housing policy and objective and to put that policy into effect through a new Federal agency with power to invade every home in America. Such a proposal as this goes beyond our traditional concept of American Government. It violates our concept of every man's home being his

castle, a principle as old as time in Anglo-American jurisprudence.

Enact this socialistic scheme into law, create this vast omnivorous bureaucracy, and no home in America will be free from its invasion, or sacred from its trespass.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a broadcast, and in the other to include a speech made by her.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the American Nation.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], may be granted a leave of absence on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is properly named the housing bill of 1949, because during the 18 years I have been a Member of Congress there have been at least 30 different agencies that have attempted to build houses. Who has been in charge of most of those agencies? The first one was Henry Wallace. Then we had Harold Ickes. Then Harry Hopkins. Then we had Rexford Tugwell, then Dr. Alexander; so I think the gentleman from Illinois, my good friend [Mr. SABATH], speaks very casually when he talks about this not costing anybody anything, when he says private industry and private enterprise are for this bill. I would ask him how in the world private industry could be for anything of such a nature in view of the past record of the administration of these programs by Tugwell and the others, their record in the realm of economy, and the reckless spending on such programs.

I would say that the principal reason I am opposed to this bill is it is my unqualified belief that this nor any other Congress has the right to tax one group of neighbors to provide some other neighbors selected by some bureaucrat with a ten or twelve thousand dollar home for which the second man will have to pay but a fraction while the first man will pay the remainder for him. We must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time there are 12,000,000 citizens of this country who are paying monthly installments on their own homes. Many of these 12,000,000 who are paying monthly installments went into cheap homes worth probably three or four thousand dollars. Many of these homes did not have modern conveniences; yet that individual in the good old American way works nights and Sundays to improve his bathroom and other parts of his home. If, however, this bill is enacted into law his neighbor will march in and take over a home with all modern conveniences, while the first man who has been paying monthly installments on his home and has been trying to improve it in the good old American way by working with his hands will have to help pay for the new home for the neighbor. To illustrate, Mr. Speaker, we could take two individuals working side by side, making the same wages. One through frugality saved the down payment, we will say, of a thousand or fifteen hundred on his home and pays monthly installments of $65 while the other man right beside him for a home with all modern conveniences will be paying but a fraction of that. Furthermore, at the present time there are approximately 15,000,000 people who now want homes, yet less than a million homes is provided under this bill. How will the million who are to receive homes be selected out of the 15,000,000 who want new homes? That is where the bureaucrats move in. Another thing, as has been mentioned by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], we must take into consideration our gigantic national debt which now stands at the total of $252,000,000,000, or more than the total assessed valuation of all the property west of the Mississippi River. While Canada has given her people a 32-percent-tax reduction since the war, we continue to tax and tax, and spend and spend; while the national debt of Canada is only $11,500,000,000; as I have mentioned, the national debt of the United States is $252,000,000,000.

This bill will cost the taxpayers $16,000,000,000. This is $40,000,000 for every congressional district in the United States—$40,000,000 will buy 4,000 homes at $10,000 each. I am asking if each Member here expects to receive 4,000 homes in his district under this so-called program? We will be fortunate if we receive 1,000 units in our district. The remainder of the money will be dissipated through pay rollers, administration, and bungling. All we have to do to know this well is to look at the record of public housing the past 16 years.

Mr. Speaker, it has been emphasized here today by both the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], relative to the rapid trend of our country toward socialism. This is not a partisan proposition because our beloved ex-Senator Byrnes recently said:

> Every segment of society is demanding special privileges. Too many people want more pay for less work. Too many people are trying to transfer power to the Government. Where we will wind up, no one can tell. But if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted there is danger that the individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor, soon will be pulling an economic oar in the galley of the State, with the Federal Government regimenting our lives from the cradle to the grave.

Mr. Speaker, that statement does not come from a Republican. It comes from a member of the Democratic Party who served his Nation so well, bearing in mind, above everything else, that the salvation of this country shall not follow the isms of other countries.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, the subject of housing is one of the most vital domestic problems with which this Congress is confronted. Instead of comprehensive legislation, the Housing laws that have been passed since the end of the war are simply an unsystematic patchwork of legislation intermixed with the hope that the housing problem would take care of itself. Neither the patchwork nor the hopes have had very much effect on this problem, which is perhaps just as bad as it ever was.

Our experience over the past few years has clearly demonstrated that what is needed is a real national housing objective, a program which will provide Federal financial assistance for clearance of slums for low-rent public housing, for rural housing, and a comprehensive program of housing research. These are the things that have been neglected or overlooked in the patchwork of laws on the subject of housing that have been enacted over the past few years. But these are the things that go to the very core of the problem.

Housing conditions in St. Louis are deplorable. I know of no better place in the Nation to attack the problem of housing than my own city. Like other metropolitan areas, our great need is a program to provide low-cost homes and low-cost rental units. When I say low cost, I mean just that, not ten and fifteen thousand dollar houses or flats and apartments built to rent at a hundred dollars a month. Practically every house being built for sale or rent today is in the high-price brackets, out of the reach of the average purchaser or tenant.

In my opinion Federal assistance is absolutely necessary for cities such as St. Louis, if we are ever to relieve the housing shortage and eliminate slums. It has been estimated that there are anywhere from five to eight million families who are living in slums. A recent survey in my city showed that approximately one home out of four is in the substandard or slum category. It is shocking to learn that thousands of these dwellings are not equipped with sanitary plumbing facilities and a great many are not equipped with electricity. Most of these dwellings have long outlived their usefulness. Hundreds of these old residences become obsolete or uninhabitable each year. New construction is hardly keeping pace with those that become obsolete. During the first 4 months of 1949 only 303 building permits were issued in the city of St. Louis, which is somewhat less than for the same period last year.

Those that must live in substandard dwellings do not do so by choice. In the patchwork housing laws that are now on the statute books, emphasis has been placed upon high cost and high rental

housing. That does not help these people. It helps only those who can pay the high prices and the high rents. Those who cannot afford to pay live in hand-me-down homes and the slums that develop from older housing which is abandoned by the former owners seeking better places to live. Thousands of low-income families have never known anything else but ramshackle-hand-me-down hovels to call their home.

Up until now, nothing very much has been done to help those people whose income limitations require them to live in blighted areas. Much could be said about slums and their effect particularly upon children, but in a few words, I see in city slums an extravagant waste of human and other resources, which we cannot afford.

Thus far, those who have opposed public housing and the slum clearance legislation have not been able to offer a suitable alternative. Palliative measures have been urged but they do not go to the real problem of slums. Rather, they seem to work around it. It is my view that the only way slums will ever be eliminated is by the public acquisition and clearance of slum areas, with the assurance that they will be scientifically redeveloped in accordance with plans properly related to the growth and development of our cities.

I also believe that much can be accomplished by a comprehensive program of housing research. The housing industry is one that has not responded to technical advances as rapidly as others. There is no question but that a broad program of research would develop new methods and new materials which would contribute towards bringing down the costs of new housing.

This is probably one of the most important measures that will come before the Congress. It is vital to cities such as St. Louis, wrestling with the problems of housing and slums.

I am going to support the rule for the consideration of the housing bill, H. R. 4009, and I hope this legislation will be enacted into law.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4009, now under consideration and known as the housing bill, if passed, will contribute greatly to relieve the housing crisis brought on by World War II and which is still existing in all the urban and industrial areas throughout the Nation.

I realize that some Members of this body, representing rural sections, cannot fully comprehend the highly critical condition in which veterans and workers of moderate and low incomes are tolerating during this housing shortage. Statements have been made on the floor of the House today regarding the great number of homes which have been constructed during the last few years. They failed to mention that the great percentage of this new construction are homes ranging in prices from twelve, fifteen, and twenty thousand and up. The dire need in the industrial Calumet region of Indiana is for homes in the five, six, and seven thousand price range.

This legislation also provides for the clearing out of slum areas in congested urban centers. We know that slum areas not only breed disease and ill health among the occupying families, but they also provide fertile ammunition for communistic agitators who are out using every available argument against democratic government.

The consideration of the rule for this bill was before the House Rules Committee several weeks ago. We held hearings on three different days and finally on reconsideration of an unfavorable vote, the Rules Committee reported the bill to the floor of the House. The principal argument used by the opponents of this legislation was that it was socialistic in nature. This same argument was used by the opponents of the original housing bill when it was before Congress back in 1937. When the Home Owners Loan legislation was passed a short time after the depression, the same criticism was offered. When the legislation was considered by the Congress in 1934 to guarantee bank deposits up to $5,000, some of the opponents of this legislation maintained that it interfered with State's rights and was socialistic. Back during Woodrow Wilson's administration in 1916, when he sponsored the Federal farm-loan bill, the opponents of that legislation stated that it was socialistic and radical. In the year 1941, I remember listening to a 2-hour radio broadcast, celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Federal farm-loan legislation. Not one of the numerous speakers on that broadcast, in paying tribute to this great progressive legislation, mentioned anything about it being socialistic or radical after it served the farmers of this country for 25 years.

During the last 20 years, on a number of occasions, legislation has been passed by this Congress, aiding corporations and financial interests to pass over a critical period of their existence, but not one word concerning the socialistic aspects of that legislation was heard. I refer to bills calling for railway mail subsidies to the railroads; for legislation aiding banks to survive during the depression and immediately thereafter, and numerous bills of that type.

The passage of this bill will aid greatly in eventually reducing the slums and the trailer-camp areas which exist in every metropolitan city throughout our land. This bill will contribute greatly toward giving millions a little more confidence in democratic government than they ever had before. It will demonstrate that our Government is interested in the common man and his welfare and contentment.

I fully realize that this legislation cannot take care of everybody in the lower bracket who needs to buy a home within their price range, but at least it will demonstrate that our Government is trying to be of service in this deplorable housing crisis. We are spending billions across the water to curtail the spread of communism; this legislation will be of untold value in curtailing the communistic agitators in the industrial centers throughout America.

This legislation has been too long delayed and should be enacted.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

(Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, without intending any reflection upon the good faith of my colleagues who may oppose this bill which will provide for slum clearance and public housing for the lowest-income groups, I am constrained to say that the forces outside of Congress alined against it have resorted to every low and foul trick imaginable. Misstatement, distortion, and worse have become their stock in trade.

There being no meritorious arguments available to them they resort to name calling.

They say the bill is bureaucratic, it is socialistic, it is communistic. Now they say it is political. As usual they resort to misquotation. The following letter from Mr. Charles Abrams, one of the country's foremost housing authorities, is a complete answer to this latest canard:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1949, at page 7385, appears a statement on Federal housing by Congressman CHARLES W. VURSELL purportedly quoting an excerpt from one of my columns in the New York Post Home News.

I do not wish to attribute to Congressman VURSELL any willful misquotation of an article, for I believe that he, as others, have been victimized by a small group of men who are lobbying against the current housing bill. However, the excerpt he quotes is not only taken out of context and distorted to attribute to it what it does not say, but worse, it is not the correct quotation from the article at all.

Because I believe the distortion is one of a series of reckless if not deliberate efforts to discredit the housing bill and those who favor it, I respectfully refer you to the full article which is set forth on pages 392 and 393 of the hearings on H. R. 4009.

The issue I was writing about opposed an effort by the Republican New York State Commissioner of Housing who supervises State-aided housing projects to have a bill passed in the State legislature requiring that he approve all sites selected by the New York City Housing Authority whether they involved city-aid or Federal-aid. Because I felt that the administration of housing in New York City had thus far escaped political control, thanks to its unique administrative set-up under the law, and because I felt that Stichman's move was politically inspired, I opposed any amendment of the law which would break down the authority's independence and subject it to political control.

The article read: "Stichman's aim seems to be entirely political. GOP control of the Housing Authority's operation would be a great political coup. The New York City Housing Authority looms as the big political plum in the political orchard and the politician who dominates the Housing Authority controls the city's political destiny.

"Within a few years the families in public housing projects will be nearly 10 percent of the city's total, and the investment of the Authority exceed $2,000,000,000, with all this means in construction contracts, patronage, and other rewards for the worthy.

"Selection of sites enables carving out blocks where hostile voters are numerous and retenanting the projects with those who vote "right," while tenant relocation on vacant

areas could change a whole neighborhood's political complexion. * * *

"Under proper procedures, the city's independent planning commission is supposed to lay down a general plan indicating sites for housing. Both the planning commission and the housing authorities of the State were set up with safeguards against political meddling. But efforts by politicians to move into housing have begun.

"The Stichman bill would now collapse its independence with a simple blow. It should not only be defeated, it should highlight the fact that the people of the city will be ever vigilant in opposing any effort by any political clique, whatever its earmarkings, to make the underprivileged the plaything of politicians."

As the article indicated, it was the effort to put politics into housing that I was attacking. I was not saying that housing had already collapsed into politics as the excerpt implies.

The misquotation as given by Congressman VURSELL, however, read:

"Public housing is political housing * * * selection of sites enables carving out blocks where hostile voters are numerous and then retenanting the projects with those who vote right.

"Within a few years public housing will dominate nearly 10 percent of the city's families in New York City and this will mean a tremendous volume of construction contracts, patronage, and other rewards for the worthy."

Nowhere did I ever say "public housing is political housing." Nowhere could it be conceivably implied that I was favoring political housing. The spurious sentence has been supplied in place of the actual statement reading: "Stichman's aim seems to be entirely political. GOP control of the housing authority operations would be a great political coup."

Now, I am sure that, while Congressman VURSELL is a Republican, his loyalty to his party does not include omitting an unwholesome reference to it and substituting for it a mysterious sentence made of whole cloth. I am rather inclined to think that he has been taken advantage of in the following way:

My article was first picked up by Headlines, which is published by the National Association of Real Estate Boards and which is one of the active links in the real-estate-lobby chain opposing this bill.

Headlines says:

"Mr. Abrams explains, in his newspaper article, just how public housing is political housing and a means of political control."

I immediately wrote to Herbert U. Nelson, executive director of the NAREB and one of the editors of Headlines, explaining that he had conveyed the wrong impression to his readers and asked him to publish my letter. Though I have known Mr. Nelson for many years and have received many letters from him, many of which are voluntary expositions of his theories, I did not receive even the courtesy of a reply to this one.

Yet, curiously, day after day, clippings from newspapers from all over the country came to my office in which the president of the NAREB was continuing to misquote the article at meetings throughout the country. It was again quoted out of context at the hearings of the Senate and House. I would be willing to say it was all due to a mistake, were it not for an official list of instructions by the National Association of Home Builders, a close associate of the NAREB, which has come to my attention. It reads:

"Remember, the more noise you make, the more attention you will get. Go at it hammer and tongs. Make public charges that you can back up. Accuse your housing authority of squandering funds, of being inefficient and failing to live up to promises. Deride failure to clear slums and house the poor. If you put on a vigorous assault your newspapers will pay attention and your Congressman will see it. * * * If your Congressman sees stories in his papers emphasizing the failures of public housing, he will be more inclined to vote against the pending measure."

Congressman VURSELL has either seen one of the misquotations in the press and borrowed it, or he has been given the misquotation by one of the members of the real-estate lobby.

On June 13, Headlines cited Congressman VURSELL's speech with favor and praise, and still with no effort to correct the misquotation, all of which completes the circle of distortion.

Now as to my own position on the political aspects of housing, which is the main point in issue. I have not overlooked the danger of subjecting public housing to political interferences and I have written upon this often, particularly in the Future of Housing (Harper and Bros., 1946, p. 285ff). But there I distinctly said:

"Political pressure in the selection of personnel and tenants has been applied in large or small degree to most of the local housing authorities. Because of their independent structure, the authorities have generally succeeded in resisting these influences. The independence of the authority is most often a blessing to mayors importuned by tenants and district leaders for apartments. * * * the accomplishments of local housing authorities have been little short of phenomenal. The excellence of the record may be partly attributed to sound division of functions. All of the technical and administrative work is performed by the paid staff. All of the policy making is done by the authority, often on the recommendation of the paid executive and his assistants. * * * Can Government's administrative mechanisms attain the efficiency of private enterprise at its best, while the people still retain enough control of their agencies to assure democratic fulfillment of the functions? The housing record is short, mistakes have been made, policy may have to be modified, but the local authority experience has pointed the way."

The misconceptions sought to be conveyed by the real-estate lobby (which incidentally I am convinced is not speaking for the rank and file real-estate owner) is that since politics may be present in Government-aided enterprise, Government should therefore keep out of slum clearance, public housing, and all other governmental activities. It should be plain that politics intervenes in every activity of Government, including social security, flood relief, poor relief, taxation, education, and the post office. But it would be as senseless to recommend elimination of any of these functions as it would be to say that we should let ourselves be invaded by an enemy because defense might bring war contracts to worthy politicians.

When politics threatens in any field in which Government intercedes, it is the place of the citizen and the press to fight the intrusion, not eliminate the reform. We must not make the mistake of throwing out the baby with the bath water.

The effort to take over the New York City housing authority's functions was stopped in a few days by the exposure in the press. The bill was withdrawn the day my article appeared. Far from being a demonstration of the evils of politics in housing, the speed with which the bill was withdrawn was a remarkable example of public alertness and press response.

Of course, public housing looms as a political plum. So does relief. So does every public works program and every city, State, and Federal expenditure that has ever been made. But the danger is far less in the relationship between a Federal agency and a local public agency than between a Federal agency and private enterprise seeking the Federal bounty. It is from building and loan associations benefiting from $2,700,000,000 of Federal credit aid and from home builders looking for vast FHA benefits from which the major lobbying pressures against the housing bill have emanated.

The local housing authority in New York City, headed by Gen. Thomas F. Farrell, was and is an independent agency set up with safeguards against political interference and so far the people of New York, I believe, have been given a relatively nonpolitical administration of housing.

The authority members in other cities come mostly from the ranks of labor, banking, business, and the professions. They are in most cases unpaid. Terms of office of members are staggered so that no one political official will have the sole appointive power. No more than one city official may be a member. They have their own borrowing powers and the right to acquire land. Of the 500 active authorities throughout the country, not one major scandal has been revealed though billions have been spent. Construction cost has been low and building efficient. The local housing authority as a mechanism for fulfilling public functions has, I believe, turned in one of the most remarkable performances in the history of public administration. I consider it a demonstration that may well be copied in other fields.

I do not claim that every housing authority is or will continue to be free from political meddling. Nor can any public agency for that matter. But when that happens and when, as in this instance, the public is alert and responsive, it is an example of democracy functioning at its best. The experience, far from being an attack on housing authorities, was a signal tribute to them.

Sincerely,

CHARLES ABRAMS.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole and include a letter from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and Commander Perry Brown, of the American Legion, in support of the bill and that the Clerk may be permitted to read both letters.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we are not considering the bill at this time. We are considering the matter of consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are the representatives of the people. We, the people, adopted the Constitution and the people are the source of our power and our authority. The question here is whether or not the people, from whence comes our power, who have expressed their interest throughout the length and breadth of this land in this legislation, are entitled to have it considered by the House.

A vote against this rule is not a vote against the bill but is a declaration by the House of the United States that it does not care to function.

I have heard many cries of socialism. Always when we attempt to do something for the plain people you will hear that cry; but there was no cry of socialism when we bailed out the banks, the insurance companies, and the railroads, with billions of dollars and put them on their feet.

There was no cry of socialism when we helped the big interests, but now because of the aftermath of the war, with an emergency that still exists, when we

want to help some of the people that carried our fight to the enemy and preserved our liberties, we hear the cry of socialism. I do not attach much importance to these prophets of evil, for we hear them every time conditions like this arise.

Who is in favor of this bill? Every labor organization in the United States. I have received permission to read a letter from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and from Perry Brown, commander of the American Legion expressing the approval of the organizations they represent of the bill. All of the veterans organizations and all the labor organizations are heartily in favor of this bill. Would it not be an affront to the American people, for the House to refuse to consider this legislation and further considering the fact that 42 States have passed enabling legislation and the mayors of almost all the cities of any size recognizing the necessity of this legislation are heartily in favor of it. To say that we do not care to consider it; that we do not care to have it brought before the House; that we should vote down the rule and close our ears and shut our eyes to the great problems that are presented in the bill would show an utter disregard of our duty and would fail to heed the wishes of the people. Would that be the proper course for us to pursue? I think not, and I do not believe that you want to evade the issue. I do not believe you want to shut your ears to the arguments. I believe you want to hear this question discussed fairly and freely.

After some persuasion, the Committee on Rules granted a rule. It is an open rule. It provides for 8 hours debate. It provides for the offering of amendments. It will give every Member the right to express his opinion on this bill.

Furthermore, I want to say that at the proper time I, as chairman of the committee, will introduce an amendment reducing the number of housing units from 1,050,000 to 810,000 to conform to the bill that has been passed by the Senate. There will also be an amendment introduced that will extend title I and section 608 of title VI of the National Housing Act for 60 days in order that we may give some consideration to its extension as permanent law. We also intend to introduce an amendment that will increase the authorized insurance of title II by $500,000,000, which will permit that section to function as the present authorization will be exhausted this month. Those sections have been greatly advocated by the builders and the private industrial interests of the United States, and they will be included in this bill, and when you vote for the bill, you will vote to give these private interests that have made such a great protest against the bill an opportunity to get the assistance from the Government to obtain the necessary funds for the prosecution of their business. You, who have called this a socialistic enterprise, must remember that in 1937 we inaugurated the subsidized low-rent housing projects and there are 152,000 units now under the same provisions that are provided in this bill giving the people subsidized housing. Has that disturbed the ordinary processes of our Government? Has that taken away our liberties? Has that led us into socialism? I have got to say that I yield to no man in his admiration for the Constitution of the United States, but when the interests of the people are at stake, when big wars come, the Constitution even has to bend a little. But I do not think the Constitution has at all been invaded by this character of legislation. I think it is not contrary with the fundamental principles of our Government. We, the people, made the Constitution, and we, the people, can change the form of government without revolution. They can change it by the ballot and substitute any other form they desire.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I do not understand that there is any concerted fight made on the rule. As far as I am concerned, I should like to see the rule accepted and then enter upon the debate on the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. I am glad that doubt has been dispelled.

Mr. COX. I never had any idea that there was any fight on the rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky seems to be under the impression that there is some sort of organized opposition to this rule. I should like to say to him very frankly that I know of no organized opposition to adoption of the rule, and I presume that it will be adopted.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sorry I cannot yield. My time is too short.

Mr. SPENCE. There was an organized opposition to the rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I said I do not know of any organized opposition to the adoption of the rule.

I take this time, Mr. Speaker, for a little different purpose than that which has been expressed heretofore. There has been a great deal of talk in the last few days from those in very high places as to some sort of a sinister lobby which has been operating, presumably in Washington, in opposition to this legislation. I rise to call attention to the fact that the only lobby or pressure activity that I have experienced has seemingly come from the other side from those favoring this public housing legislation.

I want to read into the RECORD a letter which has been sent to me, in fact, I received several copies of this letter. It is from a housing authority. Before I read the letter, may I say that I have shown this communication to my colleague whose name is mentioned in the letter, as well as my own, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCSWEENEY], and I want to add that I am confident he has had nothing whatsoever to do in any way with the issuance of this letter.

This letter is on the letterhead of the Canton Metropolitan Housing Authority, of Canton, Ohio. It is dated June 18, 1949, and it reads as follows, I quote:

DEAR FRIEND OF HOUSING: The 1949 housing bill H. R. 4009 is finally scheduled for debate Tuesday, June 21.

I

Now, will you write or telegraph to Congressman JOHN MCSWEENEY, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., covering the following points:

(1) Thank him heartily for his enthusiastic support of H. R. 4009 in the rules committee.

(2) Request that he continue his support by constant attendance during debate.

(3) That he please vote against all crippling amendments.

(4) And that he register his final vote in favor of passage.

The opposition is, and will continue to be, terrific and relentless.

Please communicate with him now in your own name and for your organization and get others to do the same.

Congressman MCSWEENEY has been very helpful—he needs some encouragement and backing today.

II

Please also write or telegraph Congressmen CLARENCE J. BROWN and STEPHEN M. YOUNG asking their support of H. R. 4009, address House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Yours for victory,

HAINES A. REICHEL,
Director for Canton Metropolitan Housing Authority.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the present bill merely because it is better than nothing. However, it fails by far to meet the real need. The committee itself admits that 1,300,000 non-farm-dwelling units are required every year for the next 11 years. Despite this admission, found on page 10 of the committee's report, the bill, with the committee amendment, provides for only 135,000 low-rent, public-housing units.

Housing is no longer a subject for partisan politics. Fifty-eight million Americans are now in desperate need of decent homes. We are the wealthiest industrial nation in the world. Yet thousands of building workers are out of jobs, while the need for homes increases every day.

It is tragically apparent and generally admitted that private builders have failed to supply housing for more than that third of American families which is in the higher-income brackets. The Government must act and act forthrightly and adequately this year.

This is why I introduce my housing bill, H. R. 4277. We can and we must start building 1,000,000 low-rent, public-housing units a year. The bill passed by the Senate (S. 1070) is little more than a sop to the people. The bill now before us doles out housing with an eyedropper and is pitifully inadequate. We have a

job to do on a grand scale and we must face up to it.

Who are these 58,000,000 homeless Americans? They are not an abstract problem that we can consider in a half-hearted abstract way. They are our neighbors.

Three million American families have no homes at all. That means over 10,000,000 men, women, and children are living doubled up with parents and parents-in-law. They are crowded into nests so tightly they have no chance to live.

Thirteen million American families—that means 45,000,000 men, women, and children, are living in rotten old buildings which we blithely dismiss as substandard housing. We in New York and you in Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and the other cities know what slums mean. The word is as deadly as atom bombs.

No one can expect to avoid epidemics and be healthy when he has no sanitation, no running water in his home. No one can hope for a decent family life when he swelters through summer and freezes through winter with 8 or 10 families in a space not adequate or decent for 1.

This House knows the story. It knows, too, that there are rural slums for sharecroppers and low-paid mill workers. It knows the disgrace of housing in coal-mining communities in every part of the country.

Recently several parties from Congress went slumming right here in sight of the Capitol Building. The Members were shocked. They found a stinking, filthy, unhealthy mess. They found families living so close together it was almost impossible to breathe. They found brazen violations on a wholesale scale of the basic laws of sanitation and fire hazards. They found hell constructed in the Capital of the richest country, with the highest standards on earth.

The gentlemen were shocked. But the shocking thing is not that slums exist in the Capital. It is shocking that they continue to exist, and unless this Congress does something about it, they will go on existing for generations. And above all, the shocking thing is that these Washington slums are but examples of an inhuman practice that exists in every city, thousands of mill towns, in mining camps, and on farms throughout the land.

The gentlemen were shocked. But what did they do? They came back to Capitol Hill and they passed S. 1070—a face-saving device that masquerades as a major solution to the housing problem. This bill, H. R. 4009, now before us, is another piece of face saving. It leaves most of the poorest and all of the great mass of the middle-class working people not a bit better off than they were before the bill was devised.

H. R. 4009 and S. 1070 are just another surrender in the long series of surrenders made by Congress on the housing question since the middle thirties. Now, we have heard the announcement of another surrender. The committee has agreed to offer an amendment reducing the number of low-cost units to 810,000 over a 6-year period. Real strides toward a national housing program were made during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt when model slum-clearance projects and Greenbelt towns were brought into being.

Everybody since then, including the administration, has been giving lip service to the housing crises, especially around election times. But when the test came in the 1949 budget, what did the administration ask for in meeting this greatest of all American problems?

Out of the $40,000,000,000 Truman budget, all Federal housing activities are allotted $38,000,000. The problem that worries almost half of America day and night, summer and winter, is given one one-thousandth of Federal expenditures. We can spare billions to arm strangers abroad but can hardly scrape up a few millions to help find our own war veterans decent places in which to live.

And, of course, though this may distress most tax-paying American citizens, it should make the housing lobbies very happy. The housing lobbies have been having quite a time of it this year. The Eighty-first Congress is not so bad for them after all.

The American people were asked by radio broadcast and newspaper headlines to believe they had won a great victory when Congress passed the Rent Control Extension Act with its joker provisions for local option and net operating return.

But the real-estate boys knew better. In the April 11 bulletin of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, President Ted Maener told the boys to waste no time sopping up the gravy. Under this heading "Realtors, here's a chance," he wrote, "if a real-estate board undertakes to organize city-wide committee representing the whole rental housing industry, it can (a) get decontrol as soon as possible and (b) get fairer rent control in the meantime."

The House bill fails to broaden the slum clearance and low-cost features of the housing bill passed by the Senate to make it into something that approaches the size of the job ahead. The building lobby is laughing up its sleeve along with the real-estate boards as a result of the bill now before us.

"Let private enterprise do it," they say while half of America goes homeless or lives in places unfit for animals. They do not care who goes homeless so long as they can squeeze exorbitant profits out of those who are frozen in whatever kind of shelter they now live.

"Let the low-income families buy economy homes," they say. Richard J. Gray, president of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor, gave the answer to that in his recent testimony before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The so-called economy homes are so shoddy, he said, that we are simply building new slums.

Mr. Gray also gave the committee an inkling of another tragic consequence of this luxury building policy when he testified that while the country is crying for homes, 10,000 members of the building-trades unions in New York alone are unemployed.

That we cannot go on relying on private initiative in the building industry is apparent. Government action is the only alternative. But it must be action to fit the need. We know that 3,000,000 families have no homes now at all.

We know that 13,000,000 families are living in pestilential slums in cities, mill-towns, mining camps, and farms.

We know that there are half a million families formed each year and that half a million old houses become completely uninhabitable each year.

So we know that right now 17,000,000 families—58,000,000 people— desperately need homes.

What does this bill as amended do about this need? It provides for 135,000 dwellings units a year over a 6-year period, in the low rental field. The committee has now agreed to conform the House bill to this figure.

With half a million new families being formed each year and half a million old housing units being abandoned each year, that number is tragically short. The program would not begin to keep up with current needs. After 6 years the Nation would be worse off than it is now.

My bill, H. R. 4277, on the other hand, provides for the building of half a million low-rent units a year for 8 years, until 4,000,000 units are constructed.

In handling slum clearance, H. R. 4009 gives no real thought to what will become of the thousands of families moved out of the slum. H. R. 4277 provides that no family shall be forced to move until a 3 percent vacancy ratio has been created in accommodations at comparable rentals. Appropriations for slum clearance are the same in both bills.

Witnesses for both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations have testified before the House committee that S. 1070 will not in any way provide for the great mass of wage earners. The Senate passed legislation completely neglecting 60 percent of the people. Those whose incomes are so low that they can pay up to $30 a month are taken care of through the limited amount of subsidized housing provided for in the bill. But even here the provisions are so skimpy there is bound to be a wild scramble to get the projects, with first come, first served techniques. What small mining camp or mill town can hope to compete with the vast underprivileged areas of the cities? The House bill likewise fails to meet this situation.

On the other hand FHA insured housing is available only at levels too high for most working men and women to pay. Rental or purchase price payments range from $85 to $150 a month for this type housing. The average is $96 a month. What steelworker, what white-collar worker, what self-employed family can afford that kind of housing?

Sixty percent of us fall in the gap between the $30 payment and the $96 payment and H. R. 4009 does nothing for us.

H. R. 4277 meets this need squarely. My bill authorizes the issuance of $25,000,000,000 of notes by the housing authority. It authorizes Federal contributions of $1,600,000,000 over an 8-year period. Under this title it provides for

meeting the annual need through 4,000,000 units.

And H. R. 4277 goes farther. It authorizes the guaranty of $5,000,000,000 a year for 5 years for construction of low-cost nonsubsidized housing. These bonds would be sold to the public and every dollar would be returned after buying its part of decent housing.

H. R. 4277 authorizes $25,000,000 for research in housing. It authorizes 500,000,000 for loans for potentially adequate farms. H. R. 4277 authorizes $60,000,000 at $20,000,000 a year for migratory workers.

Finally, H. R. 4277 meets the question of race discrimination where it exists in ugly reality—in housing. It prohibits discrimination in past, present, or future housing in which the Federal Government has had a hand.

It is time America made up her mind whether she is a democracy. If so, she will provide housing for all races on an equal nondiscriminatory basis. The time for fine speeches has passed. If we mean what we say we will put the law into effect.

We hear great speeches about the housing lobby and the real estate lobby and other lobbies from all parties. What has Congress done? We have passed a rent control bill that the lobbies like. Let's pass a housing bill that the people like.

My bill is the only bill before Congress which gives substantial aid to families now living in slum areas, to low- and middle-income families, to small farmers and sharecroppers. This is the only bill that authorizes direct aid to the housing problems of the migratory workers.

The cost is trifling compared with the cost of armaments. Capital expenditures are limited to the subsidies. The loan funds do not represent a capital expenditure.

If we wish to show our own people and the world that we are a great democracy, we must have homes for the people that make up that democracy. We must consider homes as important as warplanes or atom bombs. We must make it clear that in a democracy a Negro needs a home and is entitled to a home, just as much as a white man.

If we come up again with too little, too late, the consequence will be incalculable. America, where 58,000,000 citizens are in desperate need of homes, must act.

Here again, we have another example of the effect of the cold-war economy on the people's needs. Twenty-four billion dollars for war and no real adequate housing for 16,000,000 American families.

COMPARISON BETWEEN H. R. 4277 AND H. R. 4009

TITLE I. SLUM CLEARANCE

H. R. 4277

Section 105 (c): No demolition until there is 3 percent vacancy ration in accommodations of comparable rental.

Section 102 (c): To obtain funds under this title authorizes issuance of obligations by Secretary of Treasury as follows: $25,000,000, to be increased by $225,000,000 on July 1, 1950; $250,000,000 on July 1, 1951; $250,000,000 on July 1, 1952; $250,000,000 on July 1, 1953; $1,000,000,000, total.

Section 103 (b): Authorized to make capital grants as follows: $100,000,000 after July 1, 1949; $100,000,000 after July 1, 1950; $100,000,000 after July 1, 1951; $100,000,000 after July 1, 1952; $100,000,000 after July 1, 1953; $500,000,000, total.

H. R. 4009

Section 105 (c): Leaves it to discretion of local governing body.

Section 102 (e): Same amounts authorized.

Section 103 (b): Same amounts authorized.

TITLE II. LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

H. R. 4277

Section 204 (h): Authorizes issuances of notes by Authority in the amount of $25,000,000,000.

Section 205 (a): Authorizes annual contributions as follows: $200,000,000 in 1949 plus $200,000,000 a year for 7 more years. Total subsidy for 8 years, $1,600,000,000.

Dwelling units: 500,000 units a year for 8 years or a total of 4,000,000.

H. R. 4009

Section 204 (h): $1,500,000,000.

Section 205 (a): $85,000,000 in 1949 plus $80,000,000 in 1950, plus $80,000,000 in 1951, plus $80,000,000 in 1952, plus $75,000,000 in 1953, $400,000,000, total.

Dwelling units: 1,050,000; 135,000 units a year for 6 years or a total of 810,000 (pursuant to committee amendment).

TITLE III. LOW-RENT HOUSING WITHOUT CASH SUBSIDY

H. R. 4277

Section 301 (3): Authorized to guarantee $5,000,000,000 a year for 5 years.

H. R. 4009

No provision made for low-rent housing without cash subsidy.

TITLE IV. HOUSING FOR DISABLED VETERANS

H. R. 4277

No specific sum authorized.

H. R. 4009

No special provision made for disabled veterans.

HOUSING RESEARCH

H. R. 4277

Title V appropriates $25,000,000.

H. R. 4009

Title III: No specific sum; provides "such sums as may be necessary."

FARM HOUSING

H. R. 4277

Title VI

Section 610: Secretary may issue notes for loan funds for dwellings on either adequate or potentially adequate farms as follows: $50,000,000 afer July 1, 1949, plus $100,000,000 after July 1, 1950, plus $150,000,000 after July 1, 1951, plus $200,000,000 after July 1, 1952, $500,000,000, total.

Section 611: Contributions for dwellings on potentially adequate farms are authorized as follows: $2,500,000 after July 1, 1949, plus $5,000,000 after July 1, 1950, plus $7,500,000 after July 1, 1951, plus $10,000,000 after July 1, 1952, $25,000,000, total.

Section 612: Authorizes $60,000,000 for migratory workers at $20,000,000 per year.

Section 613: Appropriates for grants for repairs and improvements: $1,000,000 after July 1, 1949, $2,500,000 after July 1, 1950, $4,000,000 after July 1, 1951, $5,000,000 after July 1, 1952, $12,500,000, total.

H. R. 4009

Title IV

Section 411: $25,000,000 after July 1, 1949, plus $50,000,000 after July 1, 1950, plus $75,000,000 after July 1, 1951, plus $100,000,000 after July 1, 1952, $250,000,000, total.

Section 412: $500,000 after July 1, 1949, plus $1,000,000 after July 1, 1950, plus $1,500,000 after July 1, 1951, plus $2,000,000 after July 1, 1952, $5,000,000, total.

No provision made for migratory workers.

Section 413: Same amounts appropriated.

TITLE VII. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

H. R. 4277

Section 706: Amends Civil Rights Code by prohibiting discrimination by segregation or otherwise in past, present, or future housing.

H. R. 4009

No provision made.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

SWISS CLAIMS BILL

Mr. RICHARDS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4392) to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 877)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4392) to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor, 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 to the text and its amendment to the title.

JOHN KEE,
JAS. P. RICHARDS,
THOMAS S. GORDON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
JOHN M. VORYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
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. 4392) to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor, 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 substantial differences between the House version and the Senate version of the bill pertain to the amount to be authorized and the scope of the settlement. The House version sets the amount at not to exceed $16,000,000. The Senate version sets the amount at $10,607,000. The intention behind the House version is that the legislation should authorize an amount sufficiently large to pay for the principal on all claims now agreed to, plus all possible further relevant claims for damages as may be agreed upon by the two Governments, and also to pay such interest on these claims as the United States Government may concede to be allowable under the traditional rules of international law. The House version would leave the adjustment of amounts to the further actions which will be necessary in appropriation legislation. The Senate version would provide only for the settlement of principal on such claims as had been agreed to by the two Governments at the time of the introduction of the legislation. The members of the committee of conference representing the Senate recede and thus the House version is the one accepted.

The interest rate to be allowed on the recognized claims is a matter for negotiation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Swiss Republic. It was the unanimous view of the members of the committee of conference representing both Houses that the interest as finally determined should not exceed 3½ percent.

JOHN KEE,
JAS. P. RICHARDS,
THOMAS S. GORDON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
JOHN M. VORYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4392) to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4009) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4009, with Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

CONTENTS OF H. R. 4009

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4009 consists of the unenacted portions of broad housing legislation that has been before the Congress for more than 4 years. The Members of this House have already heard something of the history and philosophy of this legislation, so I do not think that it is necessary to point out that what I am about to describe contains nothing that is basically new. The broad legislative proposals of which the provisions of H. R. 4009 are a part have been the subject of nearly 12,000 printed pages of testimony before congressional committees and of countless words of debate and discussion inside and outside of the Congress and have been fully considered and approved by the Committee on Banking and Currency during two sessions of Congress.

In essence, H. R. 4009 does five major things. First, the bill sets forth an essential declaration by the Congress of our national housing objectives—a declaration that is fully warranted by the importance of housing to the national security and welfare. Second, the bill authorizes Federal loans and grants essential if local communities are to make an effective start on the clearance of slums and blighted areas. Third, the bill authorizes Federal financial assistance to communities in order that they may resume local programs of low-rent public housing, which represents the only hope low-income families have of moving out of the slums and bad housing into decent homes. Fourth, the bill authorizes a comprehensive program of technical research and studies in housing, directed particularly at obtaining progressive reductions in costs which now prevent private enterprise from serving a larger portion of the housing need. And fifth, the bill provides Federal financial assistance for the provisions of decent homes for farm families who do not otherwise have the means of obtaining adequate shelter.

Thus this bill is directed at the most urgent housing needs. It is directed at conditions which, in the judgment of many of us, probably contribute more than any other factor in American life to the destruction of human values, the most precious asset in our democracy. Our Government, through its present aids for the financing of housing construction and home ownership, has gone a long way in encouraging the provision of better housing for the American people. H. R. 4009 would carry us further on the way, it would fill in important gaps affecting the families who are in the greatest need of housing improvement. The importance which the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency attached to the provisions of H. R. 4009 may be obtained from this quotation from its report:

> Your committee is convinced, from the evidence presented during the recent hearings made available from previous studies of the housing problem, that this bill, in combination with existing legislation, will provide a sound foundation for a comprehensive housing program.

Before going into the substantive provisions of H. R. 4009, I should like to emphasize the importance which members of our committee attach to the declaration by Congress, at this time, of a national housing policy and objectives. Our own convictions are fully supported by the recommendations arising from the important congressional investigations of the housing problem which preceded our consideration of this bill.

Congress has been legislating on housing matters for 17 years. Underlying this legislation, in connection with both permanent and emergency programs, has been the implied recognition that the well-being and security of the homes are matters of national policy and that the stability of the home-building industry is essential to the health of the economy.

We have never had, however, a statement by the Congress of our national housing objectives or the basic policies as to the respective spheres of activity for the Federal Government, local communities, industry and labor.

The need and purpose for such a declaration is supported by this paragraph from the committee's report on H. R. 4009:

> Your committee believes that such a declaration of national housing policy goal and policies is needed. It would provide a frame of reference for the use of the Congress, the administrative agencies, the local communities, and industry and labor in appraising our housing activities and progress.

Section 2 of the bill establishes as our national housing objective the attainment as soon as feasible of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family. It recognizes that this objective requires the achievement of a rate of housing production sufficient to overcome the housing shortage, to replace slums and other substandard housing, and to make a full contribution toward the maintenance of national production and employment at high levels. It states that private enterprise must be relied upon to do the major part of this job and should be given all feasible encouragement and assistance by the Federal Government and calls for assistance to communities in encouraging the production of lower cost housing of good quality. The bill makes clear that Federal assistance for slum clearance and for the provisions of decent housing for low-income families, in cities and rural areas will be made available to the extent that those needs cannot be met through reliance upon private enterprise.

The bill also establishes specific standards to assure that all housing activities of the Federal Government will be administered so as to accomplish specific

objectives consistent with and necessary for the achievement of this national housing policy as follows:

First. The production of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability and size for adequate family life;

Second. The reduction of the costs of housing without sacrifice of such sound standards;

Third. The use of new designs, materials, techniques, and methods in residential construction, the use of standardized dimensions and methods of assembly of home-building materials and equipment, and the increase of efficiency in residential construction;

Fourth. The development of well-planned, integrated residential neighborhoods and the development and redevelopment of communities; and

Fifth. The stabilization of the housing industry at a high annual volume of residential construction.

I should like to refer the Members of the House to the rather detailed analysis of the size of the housing need contained on pages 8 to 11 of the committee report. The committee concluded that about 17,000,000 to 18,000,000 dwellings would have to be provided by 1960 through new construction or rehabilitation in order to overcome the present shortage, meet the needs of our increasing population and replace or rehabilitate slum housing and other substandard dwellings.

As stated in the declaration, private enterprise will be relied upon to do most of the job. It is therefore particularly essential that clear lines of responsibility be established for the concerted and sustained efforts by industry, labor, communities, and the Federal Government necessary for the accomplishment of this very large job.

The substantive provisions of H. R. 4009 deal primarily with those areas of housing need which require a very considerable degree of public action—action which must be shared on a partnership basis by the localities and the Federal Government if any substantial progress is to be made. They are in addition to the extensive Federal aids now available for those areas of need which are predominantly the responsibility of private home building and finance.

Thus, title I of H. R. 4009 deals with the clearance of slums. There is certainly no basic disagreement among us, or among the many witnesses who appeared before our committee, that the slums are an evil thing which should be eliminated.

Communities have been concerned with the slum problem as long as most of us can remember. But the slums persist because neither private enterprise nor the cities alone within their own limited resources have been able to cope with them.

I want to include later on when I get the permission of the House as part of my remarks the petitions from the American Municipal Association, from some 42 mayors and statements from mayors of the major metropolitan areas of this Nation which have been sent to the United States Conference of Mayors in which they state affirmatively that they alone in the local communities are unable to solve this problem financially without some outside assistance.

There have been many efforts made, and they are continuing, on the part not only of our larger cities but our smaller cities in clearing up the blighted areas. I am sure that the testimony of those who appeared before our committee, the social welfare groups, the representatives of veterans and labor organizations, was such that in almost unanimous accord they endorsed wholeheartedly the provisions of this proposed legislation.

There has been a lot of talk about the so-called Baltimore plan. Mayor D'Alessandro, of Baltimore, has aptly described conditions there in the following statement:

> This is not a program of slum clearance and it does not purport to be such. It is more of a program of the maintenance and the enforcement of certain health and safety measures.

I quote directly from his statement in which he says that—

> First aid administered in the temporary absence of a doctor in no way eliminates the eventual need for the doctor's services.

He was paraphrasing then what they have done there in the city of Baltimore. This plan has been exaggerated throughout the Nation in a fashion that possibly the industry has come to refer to the plan as the cure-all; but from the testimony of the mayor of Baltimore himself appearing before our committee he has dissipated that idea.

The elimination of slums requires a major operation—an operation consisting of the public acquisition and clearance of slum areas and making them available for redevelopment. It is an operation that will cost too much money to make it profitable for private enterprise and that will cost too much, and requires too great an investment to be borne alone by the local communities. So Title I provides Federal financial assistance to local communities for such slum-clearance programs.

Under title I, a local public agency will be able to obtain from the Federal Government repayable loans financing the acquisition, clearance and preparation of slum areas for appropriate private or public development or redevelopment, in accordance with locally approved plans. After an area has been sold to redevelopers, or after its reuse value has been established through long-term leases, the Federal Government will make available grants absorbing up to two-thirds of the loss which the community has sustained in the entire operation. Local communities may credit as part of their share of the net cost of the projects, the cost of public improvements built to serve the project areas. Over a 5-year period, $1,000,000,000 in loan funds, on a revolving basis, and $500,000,000 in grants would be authorized.

It is entirely a local measure, one on which the local government, the local community, takes upon itself, with Federal financial aid and assistance, and likewise many States have enacted enabling legislation that make it possible for the States and the counties to share with the local governments in helping to solve this problem.

The benefits of this title are to be applied to acquisition, clearance and site preparation, and not to the financing of major rebuilding operations. While some cleared sites will be undoubtedly available for public housing projects at the reuse value, the bill requires maximum opportunity for private redevelopment under local plans.

The bill clearly recognizes that the very purpose of slum clearance, the improvement of housing conditions, will be defeated if adequate housing is not made available for slum families. The slum-clearance title, therefore, is placed within a bill that has as one of its major purposes the provision of such housing, in which low-income families displaced in slum-clearance projects will have first preference. Local public agencies, further would be ineligible to receive Federal assistance under this title unless they have feasible means for the temporary relocation of displaced families and their eventual permanent relocation of displaced families and their eventual permanent relocation in decent homes. Clearance of residential structures, likewise, would be prohibited until July 1, 1951, if undue housing hardship would result.

The housing purpose of the program is further recognized by the limitation of financial aid to areas which either are predominantly residential before clearance or are to be redeveloped primarily for residential use.

Some have wondered why open urban and suburban land has been brought within the scope of the slum clearance program. This is in clear recognition of the fact that an adequate program of slum clearance will require the dispersion of a part of the population from central city areas. To assure that land will be available for the provision of housing for these families, title I authorizes temporary loans for the acquisition and preparation of such sites for redevelopment. Grants would not be available for open land, however. Temporary loans may be used also to finance schools and other public facilities serving open sites for a limited period until permanent refinancing through local bond issues could be arranged.

I have already indicated to you that the crux of the slum problem is the provision of decent housing for low-income families who live in slums because they cannot find adequate housing elsewhere at the rents and prices which they can afford to pay. The same applies to other low-income families, in urban and rural areas who live in bad housing.

Despite high postwar levels of employment and income, the Bureau of the Census showed that in 1947 nearly 20 percent of urban families had money incomes of less than $2,000 and over 30 percent had incomes of less than $2,500.

During the recent hearings, our committee heard abundant testimony of the accomplishments of private enterprise. But we did not hear convincing testimony that private enterprise is supplying any substantial amount of decent housing for these families, who can pay an average of only about $27 per month

rent, including heat and all other utilities. On the other hand, the overwhelming evidence is that the lack of such private housing is the reason why such families are continuing to live in slums and other bad housing conditions. The committee summarized its findings as follows:

The testimony presented to your committee makes it abundantly clear that the great majority of the families living in the slums do so only because they cannot afford to pay what private enterprise must charge for decent existing housing. The rents which they can pay represent an even smaller portion of what private enterprise would have to charge on the basis of a sound economic return if it were to supply new housing for these families from the slums.

TITLE II—COMMENTS ON LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

On the other hand, we found that the low-rent public housing assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937 is providing decent housing for low-income families. Evidence presented to your committee showed that the median income of families residing in this public housing during the first half of 1948 was $1,884 and that the average rent being charged was $27.24 per month, including substantially all utilities. This was less than the rents being charged for substandard housing in urban areas. This record was being achieved despite the continued occupancy of some over-income families, who pay proportionately higher rents, due to war conditions and actions by the last Congress prohibiting the removal of such families from public-housing projects. The median income of families admitted to these projects during the first half of 1948 was even lower, $1,481.

We heard of no alternative that offered any prospect of achieving better results.

H. R. 4009, therefore, in title II would authorize the expansion of the financial aids to local public agencies contained in the United States Housing Act to permit the provision of 1,050,000 additional public-housing units over a 7-year period. This housing could be started at the rate of 150,000 units per year, but the President would be authorized to decrease or increase the annual rate—but not the total authorization—by 100,000 units per year.

The size of the program represents the principal difference between H. R. 4009 and a similar bill passed by the Senate, S. 1070, which authorizes a 6-year program of 810,000 units. We feel that the clear evidence of urgent need, together with the lack of any prospect of any other relief for these families, fully warrants the larger program contained in H. R. 4009.

The principal financial assistance for low-rent public housing authorized in this bill consists of annual contributions which, when the housing is completed, could reach a maximum of $400,000,000 per year. These contributions, together with local tax exemption, make it possible for the housing to be made available at rents which low-income families can afford to pay.

Experience with the present program indicates, however, that in normal years not more than two-thirds to three-fourths of the maximum Federal contributions will be required.

Under title II, the low-rent public housing title, we heard the chairman of our committee announce to the House membership here prior to going into the Committee of the Whole of the agreement that was reached so far as the program that we adopted in the committee is concerned. We had adopted a 7-year program covering some 1,050,000 units. The other body had passed earlier a 6-year program covering some 810,000 units.

The chairman and the Democratic membership, as well as a number of those on the Republican side who have expressed concern about the large number of units, stated that they would be in agreement with the program providing the number of units were reduced to the number adopted in S. 1070. This has been agreed to and at the proper time an amendment will be offered to that effect.

It is the full intent of H R. 4009 to extend the benefits of low-rent public housing to nonfarm families living in rural areas who presently live in some of the Nation's worst housing. To insure that this intent shall be carried out, title II on page 42 of the bill provides a 3-year reservation of 10 percent of the authorizations for annual contributions contracts for rural housing. The bill, on page 48, also provides for the transfer of farm labor camps now administered by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Public Housing Administration for use as low-rent housing and authorizes the latter to give preference to and in some cases reserve the projects for migratory agricultural workers and their families at rents which they can afford to pay.

I should like to answer some statements that have been made in regard to room-cost limitations.

At the beginning of this year, a number of local housing authorities requested original contractors to reestimate existing projects on the basis of the cost levels prevailing at the end of 1948. In a spot survey covering some 35 projects in various geographical areas it was found that in readjusting their costs as of the original construction date to our present-day costs of materials and labor, only in the case of 5 out of the 35, or less than 15 percent of the projects that were examined, would it be necessary to use the maximum cost limitation per room as written in the provisions of title II. And that, in two-thirds of the projects examined they could be constructed with a room-cost limitation of somewhere less than $1,750. So it is in error, as has been alleged and stated fallaciously, in using the total over-all maximum figure of $12,500 or $15,000 for a five-room unit, that the total cost of this program would reach a maximum of some $400,000,000.

On the basis of this survey the average cost would be less than $8,500, including, of course, land as well as building costs, and this would vary in different sections of the country, depending upon costs in the various geographical areas.

Likewise, in the consideration of this title we have a basis of experience in which we now have some 152,289 low-rent housing units which require a direct annual subsidy from the Federal Government. We set up in fiscal 1950 the sum of $5,000,000 against what could have been a theoretical maximum of $21,871,284. So all of these claims that this project will reach the maximum figures are utterly false and misleading, because we have a basis of experience of the existing program to make reasonable estimates.

With the amendments in this bill perfecting the security of local housing authority bonds, we expect that the local authorities will be able to obtain practically all their capital financing from private lending sources and that there will be few calls for Federal loans. The availability of Federal advances, however, must be pledged in order to obtain low interest, temporary private loans during construction. This has necessitated an increase in the total loan authorization to $1,500,000,000 from $800,000,000 for the new program and the placing of this authorization on a revolving fund basis.

This requires an additional $700,000,000 for use as a revolving fund. A loan that is repayable.

This item has been carried as an over-all cost item by the opponents of this legislation.

I have already spoken of the fact that the present low-rent public housing program is providing decent homes for low-income families who would not otherwise have adequate housing and that it is in no sense competitive with private enterprise, except the segment of private owners who profit from slum conditions. To further assure that the additional program will benefit only inadequately housed low-income families and that it will not be competitive with decent private housing, H. R. 4009 contains some additional limitations. We require that a gap of at least 20 percent be left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise unaided by public subsidy is providing, through new construction and available existing structures, a substantial supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing. The local authorities must establish maximum income limits for admission and continued occupancy and must remove from the projects families found in annual reexaminations to be ineligible. We require that tenants be selected in accordance with most urgent housing needs and that there be no discrimination against welfare families.

These provisions, in combination with the requirement that the incomes of families—except for an allowance of $100 per year for each minor dependent—may not exceed five times the rent, provide statutory assurance that the low-rent housing assisted under this bill will be made available only to low-income families who are presently inadequately housed. The $100 allowance for minor dependents, of course, is in recognition of the greater difficulty low-income families with children have in making ends meet and in finding adequate housing.

Families displaced in slum-clearance projects will have preference over other low-income families. Among either group disabled veterans of World War II, families of veterans and servicemen who died from service-connected causes, and other veterans and servicemen shall have preference in the order named.

I am not going to go into detail on the changes in the construction-cost limits, which are fully explained in the committee report. These revisions take into account the increases in construction costs which have occurred since the United States Housing Act was enacted in 1937, make possible the more adequate provision of housing for larger families and recognize that there is no substantial variation in costs between larger cities like Pittsburgh, Pa., and smaller cities in the same areas like McKeesport. I should like to comment on the maximum cost limits established under the bill, since so much comment has been raised concerning them.

The new maximum per-room cost limit is $1,750 per room, exclusive of land and nondwelling facilities, in contrast with the previous limitations of $1,000 and $1,250 per room. This increase is substantially less than the actual rise in building costs which has occurred since 1937. The PHA Commissioner is authorized to increase this limitation to $2,500 in certain unusual high-cost areas. The recent experience of local authorities in high-cost areas has fully demonstrated the necessity of the latitude permitted in this bill if low-income families in these cities are to receive the benefits of this legislation.

Much has been made of the fact that under these limitations a 4-room public-housing unit could cost, exclusive of land and nondwelling facilities, as much as $10,000, whereas the average total cost of a private-rental-housing project receiving the maximum benefits of FHA insurance could not exceed $9,000. First I should like to point out that this maximum cost—and it is a maximum cost which in contrast to FHA-assisted private rental housing would apply only to certain high-cost areas—the general limitations of $1,750 per room would not permit the construction cost of a four-room unit to exceed $7,000. I am quite confident that an analysis of typical FHA rental-housing projects would show that the apartments are not averaging more than four or four and a half rooms. The limitations on annual contributions in this bill, furthermore, would not permit 1,050,000 public-housing dwelling units to be provided at an average total cost, including land and all other facilities, in excess of $8,500 per unit.

The further fact is that projects developed up to the war were built at a total development cost averaging $4,649 per unit, an extremely low figure considering the fact that the projects were generally fireproof and designed for a long economic life, that the costs in many cases included the acquisition and clearance of slum sites and that they frequently covered investments in certain features, like internal utility distribution systems, which have paid big dividends in lower operating costs.

The act requires that the projects shall not be elaborate or expensive and that economy shall be promoted in construction and operation and H. R. 4009 further requires the advance approval by the Public Housing Administration of all main construction contracts.

Altogether past experience and the requirements under the act will assure that the public housing will be built economically. Considering the fact that they must apply to the entire country, the dollar cost limitations are reasonable. Any lower or more restrictive limitations, in my judgment, would either deny the benefits to low-income families in many areas or would so reduce standards of construction as to increase the costs of maintenance and thus the amounts of annual contributions that would have to be paid. A few additional dollars wisely spent in construction will pay for themselves many times over in the savings in maintenance costs.

TITLE III—HOUSING RESEARCH

The whole problem of costs, for private as well as for public housing, is one that requires a separate and coordinated effort under the leadership of the Federal Government. Such an approach is contained in title III of H. R. 4009 which authorizes a comprehensive program of housing research.

One of the primary reasons why Federal financial assistance is needed for the programs which I have just described is the inability of the housing industry over the years to produce housing of good quality at a price or rent within the reach of a majority of families. The high cost has limited the market for new housing to perhaps the top third of the income range and has prevented the development of any effective private enterprise technique for the replacement of worn-out and substandard used housing.

Studies conducted by several congressional committees have made it clear that the lagging progress in this direction stems largely from the complexity of the housing industry and the fact that it is predominantly comprised of small business firms with insufficient resources to undertake the kind of research that has resulted in the impressive technical progress in other industries of comparable over-all size.

The necessity for Federal leadership and assistance in housing research was emphasized by the Joint Committee on Housing. In this connection, I would like to read this brief excerpt as follows:

> There should be provided the basic authority for a program of technical housing research and studies within the Housing and Home Finance Agency to initiate and coordinate research activities aimed at the reduction of housing costs through the development and acceptance of more efficient home-building techniques and methods, and new materials and equipment, utilizing fully existing private and public research and testing facilities and placing special emphasis on promoting the development and adoption of improved and standardized building codes and stanardized dimensions and methods for the assembly of home-building materials and equipment.

These findings have been fully substantiated during the hearings and studies concluded by our committee. They are demonstrated by the fact that there are rows of unsold new houses in key cities over the country because inflated construction costs, high prices, and buyer resistance have kept these houses from finding purchasers. Your committee received evidence that many builders are abandoning or curtailing their operations because of these conditions. This situation, in the face of the continuing needs of several millions of veterans and others for decent places in which to live, epitomizes what has been wrong for many years with our housing situation. The reason we have slums and overcrowding and doubling up is that we have not yet produced homes that enough people can afford to buy or rent.

The most important purpose of the research title is to seek the means of bringing housing costs down to a closer relationship with average consumer incomes and of developing the housing industry more in line with the Nation's large long-range housing needs. The Housing Administrator would be directed to encourage the development of new and improved techniques, materials, and methods which will result in better products at reduced costs and to demonstrate them and promote their acceptance. The present research program limited to building codes and modular coordination would be retained under the pending bill. Also authorized is the development of more precise economic and market data on housing which is badly needed by the industry, communities, and the Federal Government.

What this title does primarily is to provide leadership in housing research which no single element in the industry is able to provide and which is presently lacking in government. The bill contemplates that the Administrator will utilize to the fullest extent existing research facilities available in government, educational institutions, and other nonprofit organizations.

The importance of such a program in reducing costs and thus expanding housing production justify the enactment of this title and the assurance, when annual appropriations are considered, of sufficient funds to permit it to go forward.

TITLE IV—FARM HOUSING

Title IV would deal with a separate and distinct phase of the housing problem—the problem of providing decent farm housing. The urgent need for such a program is stated by the committee, as follows:

> Despite this relatively improved financial position for farming as a whole, a large proportion of our farm families is still unable to obtain adequate housing. The committee is informed that even in 1947 more than 2,000,000 farm families produced farm products valued at less than $1,500. It seems evident that most of these farm families would not be able to improve their housing conditions without financial assistance along the lines provided for in this title of the bill.

Title IV is directed principally to assisting self-sufficient or potentially self-sufficient farmers who are unable other-

wise to provide adequate housing and other necessary farm buildings for themselves or for their tenants, sharecroppers, or laborers.

In the case of a self-sufficient farmer, the assistance would be in the form of 33-year loans, with a maximum interest rate of 4 percent, to finance such improvements. The farmer's equity in his farm could provide the security for the loan.

If, however, the farmer's income was presently insufficient to carry the loan, but if he agrees to carry on a program of farm enlargement, improvement, or adjusted practices that will put him on a self-sufficient basis, the loan could be supplemented by annual contributions, for not more than 10 years, to be applied as a partial credit on debt service on the loan.

While it is not feasible or desirable to finance new permanent improvements on farms which are not presently or potentially self-sufficient, we believe that it is essential to eliminate conditions on such farms which are hazardous to health and safety. Title IV, therefore, provides loans and grants for minor improvements, such as roof repairs, safe water supply, sanitary privies, screens, and building supports which will remove such hazards and protect the occupant's property. The maximum assistance for such purposes to any farm, dwelling, or building may not exceed $1,000 of which not more than $500 may be a grant, and the maximum available to any individual may not exceed $2,000.

The bill authorizes loans which may reach a maximum of $250,000,000 after the fourth year, annual contributions not exceeding $5,000,000 in any year and grants totaling $12,500,000.

The financial aids will be administered through the Farmers' Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture, since they are closely related to other programs of this agency. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in addition, to expand existing technical services to farmers and to conduct a broad research program, both pointed toward more efficient and economical construction of farm houses and buildings.

While the financial assistance authorized in title IV is modest in relation to the farm housing need, it will permit substantial progress to be made in improving conditions on farms.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

I take time to mention only a couple of of the miscellaneous provisions contained in title V.

In retaining in H. R. 4009 the authorization to the Bureau of the Census to conduct a census in 1950 and every 10 years thereafter, our committee was fully conscious of the recent action of the House in approving such a census in 1950. Our motive is twofold. First, we have been impressed with the urgency of authorizing the 150 census, because of the huge job of preparation facing the Census Bureau. The authorization contained in H. R. 4009 is the same as that contained in S. 1070, the similar bill which has already passed the Senate. On the other hand, the separate bill passed by the House, H. R. 2203, has not yet been scheduled for consideration on the crowded Senate Calendar. We believe, therefore, that quicker action can be anticipated if this authorization is retained in H. R. 4009.

The second point is that the practically unanimous support given to the housing census justifies the authorization for a periodic census of housing after 1950.

The other provisions which deserve comment are those permitting agencies in the District of Columbia to participate in the slum-clearance and public-housing programs authorized in the bill. By restoring to the National Capital Housing Authority the power to acquire sites for low-rent public housing, section 508 would put this authority on the same basis as local authorities in other cities.

Section 509 would not change the present District of Columbia Redevelopment Act, but would provide an alternative method of financing slum-clearance projects so that the Redevelopment Agency could participate in the benefits of title I of this bill.

In view of the deplorable slum conditions within the shadow of this Capitol Building, it would be most inappropriate for the Congress to deny to the District of Columbia the opportunity to participate on an equal basis in the benefits of legislation applicable to the rest of the country.

Mr. Chairman, the need for this legislation has been demonstrated time after time by studies conducted by the Congress. It has the strong support of citizens' groups, veterans' organizations, labor organizations, civic and professional organizations, and the mayors and other local officials throughout the country. I am confident that this House will respond to the wishes and needs of the people and promptly enact H. R. 4009.

Out of the dust and ashes of the bombed areas of Europe the coming years will see the building of some of the greatest cities the world has ever seen. The new Warsaws, Rotterdams, and Coventrys will rise with majestic grandeur from the devastation and ravages of war. Our Government is helping to make this possible. And while this is happening, are we here in America to witness the gradual decay of our own great cities and the continued development of slums and blighted areas in which no human being should be expected to live? Certainly that is not the American way, and we must show to the world that we can meet this challenge here at home.

STATEMENTS WITH REFERENCE TO SLUM CLEARANCE AND HOUSING NEEDS IN TYPICAL AMERICAN CITIES

(Compiled by Paul V. Betters, executive director, the United States Conference of Mayors)

BIRMINGHAM

The housing and slum-clearance bill up for consideration this week in the House is one of the most vital needs of the cities of our country. We urgently recommend its passage and as president of the United States Conference of Mayors, and in behalf of the United States cities, we respectfully ask of the House that they give this bill their earnest consideration, and we pray for the passage of this act, because from the slum areas of the cities we know crime, communism, and disease thrive and prosper. Housing in many cities is a dire necessity due to crowded conditions, especially in the lower-income groups. Sixty percent of the population of our country live in urban areas today, and we the mayors of the American cities deplore the slums and the housing situation, but financially we can do little without the passage of the housing and slum bill. We appreciate deeply all efforts to eliminate this cancerous growth on our American way of life. (W. Cooper Green, president, United States Conference of Mayors, mayor of Birmingham.)

PITTSBURGH

Pittsburgh desperately needs housing action contemplated in H. R. 4009. Our local housing authority has long had applications pending for 7,000 low-rent homes. Our actual need is much greater. And it is my hope that we will double that figure when the bill is passed. Present new housing in Pittsburgh is not being built within price range of low or even little income families. Only public housing can meet needs of the lower-income groups and wipe out once and for all the slum environment which has been a blot on the boasted American way of life. For private housing developments the urban redevelopment sections of the bill are vital to restore solvency of American cities. Blighted areas must be cleared and rebuilt. We in Pennsylvania are combining State and city action for this purpose, depending on Federal aid to complement our program. I am sure that every public official in the city administration joins me in urging prompt approval of H. R. 4009. (David L. Lawrence, mayor, city of Pittsburgh, vice president, the United States conference of mayors.)

BALTIMORE

Housing bill H. R. 4009 offers best opportunity ever for cities such as Baltimore to carry out badly needed slum-clearance and redevelopment program. Our plans have been under way for a long time and we now urgently need financial assistance provided in H. R. 4009. Provision of adequate quantity of low-rent public housing for families of low income absolutely necessary in connection with slum-clearance and redevelopment program. Housing shortage in Baltimore still acute. Although high home-building rate in Baltimore area last 2 years, new houses started were 6,000 below increase in family formation. Large proportion of dwellings too high priced for most families. Slight increase available rental units does not meet demand of moderate- and low-income groups, either in quantity or in price. Housing authority has about 20,000 applications on file. Over 8,000 new applications received at housing authority last year. Recent survey of applicants shows more than two-thirds have total family incomes below $2,500. Over nine-tenths of all applicants lived under substandard conditions. Fifteen percent of applicants were eviction cases. Poorly housed low-income families in dire need of decent houses constitute bulk of applications on file. Steady flow of new applications is thus good index of continuing need for a decent low-rent public housing in Baltimore. Passage of H. R. 4009 only way to provide for desired goal of slum clearance, redevelopment, and additional good housing for low-income families. (Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of city of Baltimore, chairman of standing committee on legislation, United States conference of mayors.)

NEW YORK CITY

The housing shortage in New York City has been one of our most critical problems since the end of the war. Every action open to the city has been taken since January 1, 1946, and we have put under construction the largest program of low-rent housing ever attempted. Despite a record building program, New York City needs the help of the Federal Government to make any real headway in solving its serious problem of housing for families of low income.

The housing and slum-clearance bill reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency is an excellent bill. It offers real hope of decent homes to the Nation's lowest-income group. New York City is prepared to put its share of housing in planning immediately. We have sufficient construction firms and labor to build at least 10,000 apartments each year of the life of this program, in addition to our present construction program.

New York City recommends approval of the slum-clearance provision now in the House bill. Large areas of slums in New York City need clearance and redevelopment. The bill would permit a large amount of such work which could not be done without Federal assistance.

By passing the pending housing bill, Congress will take a positive step toward solving the housing crisis. (William O'Dwyer, mayor of New York City.)

PHILADELPHIA

The city of Philadelphia is doing everything humanly possible to recreate here the best possible environment for living and working. Because of financial limitations, it will be necessary to have the assistance of the Federal Government if we are to achieve our high goal of civic improvement.

In the program of redevelopment of old areas, Federal assistance will be necessary in helping to meet the cost.

This same assistance must be forthcoming to solve the problem of production of an adequate quantity and quality of housing for all elements of our population, especially for families of low income.

Better housing conditions and slum clearance, of course, would be reflected in the cost of the operation of our police and fire units. Bright, cheerful homes, and adequate space for recreational activities would go a long way toward reducing delinquency among the youth of the city.

The method for giving us the required Federal assistance will be for Congress to determine. (Bernard Samuel, mayor of Philadelphia.)

DETROIT

Housing shortage Detroit City, estimated at 50,000 families lacking own home, living in rooms, trailers, or with another family. Additional 48,000 dwelling units needing major repairs or lacking water or minimum sanitary facilities. Present waiting list eligible families for public housing 8,700 families is highest ever, despite efforts of local authority to discourage applicants. Expressways, slum clearance, playgrounds, and other public improvements already programed expected dislodge 10,000 families next 5 years, of whom estimated 6,000 eligible public housing. In addition 6,500 families in temporary war and veterans' housing to be rehoused. Estimated 40,000 families in Detroit have annual income below $2,000 and additional 70,000 between $2,000 and $3,000. Thus, approximately 100,000 families eligible public housing. Immediate need for low-rent housing conservatively estimated 50,000 families. Now have 5,000 permanent public housing units. Seven thousand three hundred and seventy-six private housing started year ending March 1 were only 45 percent previous 12 months. Total new multiples for rent started were 635. Virtually no rental housing built since war rents below $80 per month, 85 percent of it rents $90 or more, median rent available homes over $100. Slum-clearance program essential to preserve city's tax base. City plan commission has designed 2,520 acres in need redevelopment. Present annual average tax revenue $864 per acre. If privately redeveloped would yield $2,304. Increase would pay city's third net project cost in 10 years. Public housing 10 percent shelter rent in lieu would amount to $700 per acre. Redevelopment 80 percent private, 20 percent public housing, would pay city's share costs in 12 years. Data juvenile delinquency, health, fire costs, and so forth, and more detailed data of above summary has been transmitted to our Congressmen. (Mayor Eugene I. Van Antwerp.)

SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco housing shortage still acute. No exact data available but vacancies hard to find anywhere in bay area. San Francisco Housing Authority waiting list 3,521; 7,700 temporary dwellings and 1,750 low-rent dwellings fully occupied. Housing authority has removed over half of families ineligible because of incomes over income limits; is removing more each month. San Francisco real-property survey, 1939, revealed approximately one dwelling of every six was substandard. Ratio today probably about the same. Low-rent-housing market analysis, 1945, showed approximately 26,000 families in need. Housing authority contemplated 5,000 new low-rent dwellings if housing bill enacted. This housing essential to relocated families living in areas scheduled for redevelopment. Redevelopment areas expensive to acquire and clear. City will need Federal loans and capital rent subsidies to enable private enterprise to rebuild in blighted areas. San Francisco planning and housing association, citizen's group 1947, compared same-size good and bad neighborhoods. Studies showed the following: Bad neighborhood, 100 juvenile delinquents; 762 public welfare cases; 4,771 adult arrests. Good neighborhood, 17 juvenile delinquents; 38 public-welfare cases, 39 adult arrests. Bad neighborhood had twice the fires, 36 times as many tuberculosis cases; 66 times as many city hospital cases; 3 times as many babies died. Municipal service in bad neighborhood cost $750,000; in good neighborhood $86,000. Tax revenues from bad neighborhood were $370,000; in good neighborhood, $543,000. Bad neighborhood is in area designated for redevelopment. San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed resolution endorsing H. R. 4009, Housing Act of 1949. (Elmer E. Robinson, mayor of San Francisco.)

BOSTON

Please record my wholehearted support of H. R. 4009 which it is expected will reach the House floor this week. Boston is 300 years old and possibilities of clearance of substandard areas and erection of new housing for low-income families with Federal aid would be a boon to this city. These twin problems are so great that this city cannot solve its problem alone. The Federal Government with broader tax base is better equipped to give substantial help. Conservative estimates indicate 50,000 substandard homes in Boston out of 210,000 dwelling units or 24 percent, with depreciation and obsolescence growing daily. In this city 14,000 dwellings now standing were built before 1860. Thirty-seven thousand built before 1880, 80,000 or 38 percent, built before the turn of the century. Only one family out of five owns its own home, making Boston a city of rent payers. Whole areas of the city are in need of clearance, replanning, and redevelopment. Boston Housing Authority in receipt of 21,200 applications for tenancy between VJ-day and November 1948, at which time applications were shut off because of utter inability to offer hope to sorely pressed citizens, great majority of which are veterans with young families. Ten thousand new families formed in this city between decennial censuses of 1930 and 1940 with 10,000 marriages above average in 4 war years. Vacancies practically nonexistent here. Courts are clogged with eviction cases and are authorized by legislation to grant up to a year leeway before families are required to vacate. I have authorized expenditure of $20,000,000 city funds for housing and State program in Boston authorizes an additional $48,000,000, which, together only begins to solve the problem. Boston can use many millions of Federal aid to help in solving its problem. Urge the honorable, the Members of the House to pass H. R. 4009 substantially as written. Would, however, request that construction cost limits, which finally made United States Housing Act of 1937 unworkable, not be included in legislation. Better that such limits be tied to regional construction costs limits or left to administrative discretion. This is an excellent opportunity for the House to enact legislation to provide homes for good Americans, and thus bulwark the Nation against inroads of atheistic communism which nurtures where poor housing conditions exist. (James M. Curley, mayor of Boston.)

CHICAGO

Following resolution was passed by the city council memorializing Congress to enact Housing Act of 1949:

"Whereas the city of Chicago faces an acute shortage of housing accommodations for its many citizens; and

"Whereas the lack of adequate housing is a continual threat to the health and well-being of many of our citizens; and

"Whereas the people of the city of Chicago have expressed their determination to assist to the limit of their financial ability in the construction of new housing and eradication of slum areas; and

"Whereas the mayor's program for housing, approved by the City Council of the City of Chicago, calls for liberal Federal assistance in carrying out this program: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the city council do hereby endorse House bill No. 4009, known as the Housing Act of 1949, which provides (1) Federal aid to localities for the clearance of slums in blighted areas; (2) Federal assistance for a low-rent public-housing program; (3) an expanded program of housing research designed to stimulate new methods of construction; and, (4) a farm housing program; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to all of the Congressmen from the Chicago district." (Martin H. Kennelly, mayor.)

CLEVELAND

Cleveland's housing shortage continues in severity particularly among low-income families. Four thousand five hundred families of veterans of World War II still currently contacting our municipally operated veterans housing service. Three thousand temporary housing units cannot be removed until decent housing is available to occupants. Thousands of substandard houses in slums cannot be demolished until dwelling available for present occupants. Acres of slums cannot be cleared for private redevelopment under our master plan and our State urban redevelopment law unless realistic provision for construction of housing for low-income occupants can be planned. Practically no private rental housing being constructed and houses constructed for sale are in $9,000 or over class. Passage of H. R. 4009 imperative for our community before it can clear its slums, making housing available for low-income families, remove temporary structures, and relieve housing problems of deserving veterans. (Thomas A. Burke, mayor of Cleveland.)

PORTLAND, OREG.

Portland population increase of over 49 percent since 1940, and the disastrous flood of 1948 which wiped out over 5,300 public-housing units then fully occupied, have combined to make the housing need here acute. Over 7,000 units of temporary housing are still fully occupied with long waiting list. We estimate the greatest need is for houses under $5,000 which private industry is not interested in producing. Maintenance of community living standards requires that adequate provision for housing of the low-income groups be made through immediate

passage of pending Federal legislation. (Dorothy McCullough Lee, mayor of Portland, Oreg.)

MILWAUKEE

Estimated need for 5,000 additional units in Milwaukee to ease housing shortage. Estimate additional 35,000 units needed to replace substandard units. Approximately 20,000 units should be low rent. Without Federal aid it is impossible to build housing for those families which are low income. In 2 weeks' time received almost 4,000 active applications for 578 units of veterans' permanent housing, also have received almost 1,000 applications for 232 low-rent slum-clearance units. City has almost exhausted its own resources in building veterans' permanent housing. Seventeen thousand veterans' applications on file with Red Cross bureau. Approximately 30 percent of city is blighted. Average weekly wage of skilled labor about $60, meaning worker can afford only $6,000 home. Lowest cost house at present level about $7,000, effectively blocking individual ownership because banks won't lend. Private rental units are $90 monthly and up. Greatest need in $50 to $60 bracket. Private builders not interested in slum clearance unless with Government subsidy. Present vacancy rate about four-tenths of 1 percent. (Frank P. Zeidler, mayor of Milwaukee.)

KANSAS CITY

Kansas City has at present no public-housing program. We are greatly in need of such enabling legislation. Housing authority and city plan commission estimate need for 4,500 units low-rent public housing. Kansas City's blighted areas cost city approximately 45 percent of city service costs and contribute only 6 percent real-estate-tax revenue. It is estimated 33 percent of population resides in blighted areas which account for five times city average of TB cases, 6 times the juvenile delinquency cases, 3 times the fire calls, and 10 times the police calls above the city average. Sixty-nine and nine-tenths percent of commitments to local penal institutions are of persons residing in these areas and 74 percent of all new parole and probation cases are from same districts. (Mayor William E. Kemp.)

CINCINNATI

Housing shortage here dangerous and unabated so far as low-income families are concerned. Overcrowding in this group at all-time high. Need estimated at four or five thousand low-rent public housing units during next few years. Our public health federation studies show white mortality in our slums three times higher for tuberculosis, pneumonia, and home accidents than in rest of city. In one of our slum-clearance projects, Laurel Homes, tuberculosis, pneumonia, infant mortality rate, crime rate, and fires per 1,000 dwellings less than for city as a whole. (Albert D. Cash, mayor.)

SEATTLE

Recent Seattle market survey completed this year by city and University of Washington shows 14,750 substandard units in Seattle proper of which 5,300 are tenant occupied by families of two to six persons. Recent study by Seattle Housing Authority based on figures revealed in market survey sets need for units to rent under $40 per month, conservatively, at 8,839. In contrast to this need, survey conducted early this year by VFW shows that of 261 units one to three rooms advertised for rent 74 percent rented for $50 or more while of 241 units four to six rooms 94 percent rented for $60 or more. Our authority still receiving 120 applications weekly on average from veterans unable to afford market price for decent housing. In light of these facts, need for slum clearance to wipe out substandard housing and construction of housing for low income appears obvious. (William F. Devin, mayor, city of Seattle.)

MINNEAPOLIS

Four years after the war the housing shortage still exists in Minneapolis. Many examples of suffering and crowding still remain. The office of the Housing Administrator has a backlog of 2,200 applicants for housing. Sixty percent of these applicants are members of the marginal income group, with an annual income below $3,000. Ceiling prices of old homes have not decreased sufficiently for members of this group to make purchases, nor are they capable of buying new houses. The city welfare department with many indigent and others unable to command housing, is hard put to find shelter for those on relief. Families of six and eight people are often housed in hotel rooms.

Veterans' groups are grateful for the temporary housing which was established in Minneapolis. However, the discomforts of such housing are more evocative of wartime life than the years of peace. Upon these veterans will fall the continued problems of housing unless permanent housing is provided for them and other people in Minneapolis.

Three thousand six hundred and seventy persons now occupy temporary housing units; 2,045 of this group are children, inheritors of the suffering indigenous to life among the prefabs and temporary housing units.

Between 1,000 and 2,000 low-rent housing units are needed in Minneapolis. The import of the term "low rent" is best exemplified in the statistics of a survey made by the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority. The surveyed area included a blighted section on the near north side of Minneapolis. A income group pays $38 per month rent in this area; B income group pays $30, and C income group, comprising one-fifth of the entire group, pays $21 per month. However, slum clearance cannot be effected without appropriate plans in hand for the establishment of low-rent housing units in the area cleared. Such a program of clearance and of redevelopment is hamstrung in Minneapolis by the lack of Federal funds. The tragedy of this situation is that substandard dwellings will have to remain to provide shelter. Such inadequate shelter has always been the breeding ground of juvenile delinquency. Families who live in such homes are highly susceptible to disease, just as they also become susceptible to criminal activities. Poor housing leads in part to increased cost in maintaining penitentiaries. Three statistics on the Sumner field housing project show that since the establishment of the project the number of fires in the area decreased one-third. Dollar loss per fire decreased between 1940 and 1948 to $36 per fire, as compared to $193 in the area previous to redevelopmnt. Police cost in the area dropped 90 percent. Prof. Stuart Chapin of the Department of Sociology at the University of Minnesota in his survey of the project in 1940 pointed out that people living in the Sumner field units developed twice as much social participation in the civic affairs of the neighborhood and city. This increased not only the moral tone of the city but the lives of these people. This comparison was made in terms of the people occupying substandard shelter in surrounding blighted areas.

The need for low-rent housing should be considered primarily in terms of the American principle of preserving American family life. Home life is the basis of family life, and the destruction of family life spiritually and materially has too often been caused in the years since the war by inadequate dwellings. (Eric G. Hoyer, mayor.)

ATLANTA

The city of Atlanta is vitally interested in the passage of a comprehensive housing and slum-clearance bill. There is still great need for housing in the low-income class both white and colored. Also there are still large slum areas which need clearance in the central and semicentral portion of the city. There are thousands of applications for the housing units we now have which cannot be filled. Quite a number of apartment buildings have been built in Atlanta under FHA loans, but they are too far out in the suburbs to serve our working people and those of moderate income. Also the rents are completely above the low-income class. The city of Atlanta has great need for an additional program of slum clearance and low-cost housing. (William B. Hartsfield, mayor of Atlanta.)

TOLEDO

We cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of legislation assisting cities with the elimination of slums and construction of housing for persons of low income. Today the most valuable areas in Toledo from the standpoint of facility and proximity to the center of activity are occupied by slums which create real problems in law enforcement and health. (Michael V. DiSalle, mayor, city of Toledo.)

MEMPHIS

Because the central portion of Memphis is traversed by five major bayou systems the adjacent areas invited construction of poorest type of shelter. Most of the so-called housing was provided more than 40 years ago and represents nearly 14,000 units unfit for repair in an area of more than 7 square miles. No slums have ever been cleared here except through public improvements and building of five public housing projects. Believe private enterprise would cooperate in redevelopment if slum sites could be made available at reuse values. Memphis needs at least 7,000 low-rent public-housing units and should apply for at least half that number if present legislation is enacted. The existing public housing program of 3,300 units is divided 28 percent for white and 72 percent for Negro occupancy and future programs, based on need, should be apportioned likewise. (Watkins Overton, mayor, city of Memphis.)

MIAMI

Our city commission has endorsed by resolution Senate bill 1070 and H. R. 4009. Consider its passage paramount; its defeat a calamity to this community. Recent survey 2 principal Negro slum areas reveals 9,500 families in slum dwellings, 6,000 of whose incomes are so low as to require public housing large projects. Public housing for Negroes on vacant land must precede slum-clearance undertaking, making housing available to displaced families. Also large segments white population here living under slum conditions. This community pleads for favorable House action H. R. 4009. (Robert L. Floyd, mayor of Miami.)

NEW HAVEN

The city of New Haven is urgently in need of a large number of low-rental units. This can be achieved by the passage of housing and slum-clearance bill—H. R. 4009—which comes up for vote on Tuesday, June 21, 1949. In behalf of the people of the city of New Haven, may I strongly urge the House to vote favorably upon this bill. (William C. Celentano, mayor of New Haven.)

HARTFORD

The city of Hartford, Conn., has urged consistently the passage of Federal housing legislation to assist city governments in their slum-clearance and redevelopment programs. This city has a program of slum clearance and redevelopment planned, anticipating the enactment of Federal legislation. I sincerely hope that the House of Representatives will approve Federal legislation without delay. (Cyril Coleman, mayor of Hartford.)

LINCOLN

Local housing authority of Lincoln has applied for 700 low-rent public units. 1940 census showed 7,000 substandard dwellings in Lincoln. A housing shortage exists here

particularly in middle-class income bracket. (Clarence G. Miles, mayor, city of Lincoln.)

BUFFALO

Regarding H. R. 4009 and Buffalo housing need. Housing inventory and population end of 1948 shows 14,000 families in excess of total dwelling unit. Estimated 30,000 families living in substandard areas of which estimated 14,000 within incomes too low for known private housing market. Local housing authority operates 2,570 permanent low-rent units. One hundred percent occupied. Average annual income tenants taken in last 6 months, $2,004. More than 6,000 applications on file. Reaffirm local authority estimate of minimum need 5,000 additional public low-rent units as presented to Federal Public Housing Administration in 1945. (Bernard J. Dowd, mayor of Buffalo.)

GALVESTON

Housing shortage still acute here especially large low-income families. Urgently need 2,000 or more low-rent units. Slum clearance and public housing as in 4009 would certainly improve general health conditions, fire hazards, end crime incidence. Juvenile delinquency would receive staggering blow under improved family living conditions. Present program proves these points. Bill badly needed, we urge quick passage. (Herbert Y. Cartwright, Jr., mayor of Galveston.)

GARY

Gary needs a minimum of 500 low-rent public-housing units to empty the basements, attics, and other substandard, unhealthy places occupied by families of low income. Comparative figures conclusively show that police, fire, health, and sanitation department cost less per family in our public housing than in our slums. Independent study shows that there are fewer criminals, fewer illegitimate children, fewer juvenile cases, fewer broken marriages, better school grades, and better workers in families rehoused in public housing than those in our slums. I urge the passage of H. R. 4009. (Eugene Swartz, mayor of Gary.)

PROVIDENCE

Providence program for slum clearance and redevelopment requires passage of H. R. 4009 to provide low-rent housing for displaced families of low income. Vital programs for new highways, playgrounds, industrial sites, as well as slum clearance are being delayed by a housing shortage. (Dennis J. Roberts, mayor of Providence.)

NORFOLK

Acute shortage exists here respecting housing accommodations at rentals within the reach of vast majority of our people. Concern of commandant of Fifth Naval district is indicative of the general situation. Recent survey by commandant discloses 2,347 Navy personnel in Norfolk area who desire to bring their families to this area but who are unable to do so because of housing shortage; 3,077 families of Navy personnel in this area now occupying trailers, rooms, and other inadequate housing.

Estimated minimum need for low-rent public housing, 3,000 units. Nineteen hundred and forty housing census revealed 9,000 substandard units occupied by Negroes, 6,000 substandard units occupied by whites. While there is no later survey available, this situation has certainly not improved. City now plagued with many blighted areas which we hope to eliminate progressively through redevelopment and public-housing projects.

Norfolk's interest in slum clearance and public housing evidenced by recent appropiation of $25,000 to the Norfolk Redevelopment and Housing Authority for a study, planning, and programing. Low-rent public housing in Norfolk efficiently operated, but grossly inadequate in scope. Administrative heads of health, fire, and police departments, and judge of juvenile court, report a very high rate of disease, delinquency, and crime in slum areas with correspondingly high servicing costs and very favorable demonstration of effectiveness of public housing. Study made in 1937 of certain slum areas comprising 1 percent of our total area and containing 14 percent of our population showed that the cost of city services in those areas exceeded the tax returns therefrom by $750,000. City vitally interested in passage of a comprehensive housing bill embracing public housing and urban redevelopment. (Pretlow Darden, mayor, Norfolk.)

ST. PAUL

The housing condition in St. Paul is still acute. I cannot see that there is any improvement, and there are indications that it is getting worse.

The high cost of construction and the lack of proper financing facilities and arrangements have made it practically impossible for a family in the low-income bracket to build or purchase a new home.

There is no rental property available to the low-income group, and families with children have a difficult time in renting any home at any price.

We have hundreds of people living in converted stores and office buildings, and many living in our cheap loop hotels under conditions that are far from desirable. These people are compelled to pay fantastic rentals as much as $210 a month for a family of seven, including five children, for two little rooms without private toilet facilities.

Our welfare board, on a check of 23 welfare families, is paying an average of $137.50 per month per family for rent alone, to keep them in these cheap hotels.

The quonset huts, which were to provide temporary housing for the returned veteran, are more in demand than ever, and we have a long list of emergency applications from veterans who have no better housing facilities for themselves and families.

We are looking forward to the passage of Federal legislation which will ease the situation by making possible low-rent public housing.

The slum areas are a disgrace to the city, and in many cases are a health and social menace. We had over 4,000 units before the war that were unfit for human habitation. These units have been increased in number, bringing practically no revenue by way of taxation, and costing our city a substantial amount of money to maintain. We can see no way of correcting this situation, other than through the enactment of a slum-clearance program by our Congress.

I do hope that the Eighty-first Congress will give us some help on the matters mentioned herein, and would appreciate being advised by you as to the progress of the housing legislation now pending. (Edward K. Delaney, mayor.)

DALLAS

Regarding general housing bill, H. R. 4009, in December 1944 Dallas filed an interim application for 2,800 additional low-rent public housing dwelling units which represent a small portion of present need. Conservative minimum estimate of substandard dwellings now 40,000. It is further estimated that a minimum of 10,000 additional families live under overcrowded conditions, doubling up in single-family dwellings. Greatest housing need in Dallas is for rental units under $50 for families of low income and modest income. Reduction of excessive expenditures for municipal services to slum areas and reduction of basic causes of disease, crime, fires, and juvenile delinquency can be effected by participation in proposed program offered in H. R. 4009. (Roderic B. Thomas, city manager, city of Dallas.)

LOUISVILLE

The housing situation in Louisville is still very acute for low-income families whose budgets will not permit the payment of rent between $30 and $50 per month without utilities. We have approximately 5,000 applications from veterans for 567 units of temporary veterans' housing. All of these apartments are presently filled. We have 3,004 units of public housing, all of which are filled, and our lists show a backlog of approximately 2,500 applications for public housing. Of these two lists in excess of 500 families have been evicted and are presently living with relatives or friends under dangerously overcrowded conditions, or have received eviction notices and are unable to find a place to move into within their means when the eviction becomes a reality.

Families who are doubled up because they cannot afford to pay rent for such housing as is presently available are conservatively estimated at several thousand. The larger part of these families are ineligible for public housing but are looking for a home to buy or rent as soon as private enterprise can supply it within their means. No actual survey has been made but one is contemplated. But based on the applications for veterans' temporary housing and public housing in which we have actual information as to their incomes, we estimate conservatively that Louisville needs approximately 1,500 units of public housing for whites and Negroes, and several thousand units of housing to be provided by private enterprise for rent at $40 to $75 per month with utilities, and for sale with a small or no down payment at prices from $5,000 to $7,000.

Just prior to the building of our first public housing project in Louisville in 1935 our planning and zoning commission made a survey of 12 city blocks in a slum area, which were subsequently cleared, and found that police, health, fire, and other city services in that area cost the city $65,000, whereas it collected approximately $14,00 in taxes. (Charles P. Farnsley, mayor of Louisville.)

A PETITION TO THE HONORABLE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas our cities do not have enough decent dwellings to house our people; and

Whereas cities have many slum areas which are detrimental to the health and welfare of the citizens and a financial blight as well; and

Whereas neither our cities alone nor with the aid of private enterprise have yet been able to provide sufficient housing or clear our slums.

Therefore, through the American Municipal Association, we petition the House of Representatives of the United States of America to take immediate favorable action on H. R. 4009, the national housing bill.

Allentown, Pa., Hon. Donald V. Hock, mayor.

Atlanta, Ga., Hon. W. B. Hartsfield, mayor.

Augusta, Ga., Hon. W. D. Jennings, mayor.

Bethlehem, Pa., Hon. Robert Pfeifle, mayor.

Biloxi, Miss., Hon. G. B. Cousins, Jr., mayor.

Cambridge, Mass., John B. Atkinson, city manager.

Camden, N. Y., Hon. George E. Brunner, mayor.

Chattanooga, Tenn., Hon. Hugh P. Wasson, mayor.

Cincinnati, Ohio, Hon. Albert D. Cash, mayor.

Columbia, S. C., Hon. Frank C. Owens, mayor.

Corpus Christi, Tex., Hon. Leslie Wasserman, mayor.

Denver, Colo., Hon. Quigg Newton, mayor.

Detroit, Mich., Hon. Eugene I. Van Antwerp, mayor.

Durham, N. C., Hon. Dan K. Edwards, mayor.

Flint, Mich., Hon. George G. Wills, mayor.

Gary, Ind., Hon. Eugene H. Swartz, mayor.

Hartford, Conn, Hon. Cyril Coleman, mayor.

Hoboken, N. J., Hon. Fred DeSapio, mayor.

Kansas City, Mo., Hon. William E. Kemp, mayor.
Lackawanna, N Y., Hon. John J. Janega, mayor.
Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. Fletcher Bowron, mayor.
Louisville, Ky., Hon. Charles P. Farnsley, mayor.
Madison, Wis., Leonard G. Howell, city manager.
Memphis, Tenn., Hon. Watkins Overton, mayor.
Miami, Fla., Hon. Robert L. Floyd, mayor.
Milwaukee, Wis., Hon. Frank P. Zeidler, mayor.
Minneapolis, Minn., Hon. Eric G. Hoyer, mayor.
New Haven, Conn., Hon. William C. Celentano, mayor.
New Orleans, La., Hon. DeLesseps S. Morrison, mayor.
New York, N. Y., Hon. William O'Dwyer, mayor.
Norfolk, Va., C. A. Harrell, city manager.
Oakland, Calif., Hon. Joseph E. Smith, mayor.
Passaic, N J., Hon. Paul G. Demuro, mayor.
Paterson, N. J., Hon. Michael U. DeVita, mayor.
Richmond, Va., Hon. W. Stirling King, mayor.
Rockford, Ill., Hon. C. H. Bloom, mayor.
Saint Joseph, Mo., Hon. Henry D. Allison, mayor.
Saint Louis, Mo., Hon. Joseph M. Darst, mayor.
St. Paul, Minn., Hon Edward K. Delaney, mayor.
Seattle, Wash., Hon. William F. Devin, mayor.
Stockton, Calif., Hon. Angelo Sanguinetti, mayor.
Syracuse, N. Y., Hon. Frank P. Costello, mayor.
Toledo, Ohio, Hon. Michael V. DiSalle, mayor.
Waterbury, Conn., Hon. Raymond E. Snyder, mayor.
Wichita, Kans., Hon. William C. Salome, Jr., mayor.
York, Pa., Hon. Felix S. Bentzel, mayor.

Respectfully submitted by the American Municipal Association on behalf of those whose names are listed above.

CARL H. CHATTERS,
Executive Director,
American Municipal Association.

JUNE 20, 1949.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, recently the following deputies from the National Assembly of Panama visited our Congress: The Honorable Felipe O. Perez, the Honorable Luis Raul Fernandez, the Honorable Norberto Zurita, and the Honorable Aquilino Boyd.

During their visit these deputies presented to the Speaker a scroll bearing greetings from the National Assembly of Panama. A translation of those greetings is as follows:

[Coat of arms of Panama]

[Flags of Panama and the United States]

To the Congress of the United States of America, greetings:

Whereas the Honorable Deputies Felipe O. Pérez, Raúl Arango N., Aquilino E. Boyd, Luis Raúl Fernández, Bernardino González Ruiz, and Norberto Zurita are traveling to the United States of America on an official mission of this assembly;

Whereas advantage should be taken of this circumstance in order that the afore-mentioned honorable deputies may carry a message of cordiality from the National Assembly of Panama to the Congress of the United States of America, the National Assembly of Panama—

Resolves to express its desire that the Congress of the United States of America may achieve the greatest success in its legislative labors, for the satisfaction of the people of the United States and the general benefit of the cause of America.

Panama, May 7, 1949.

ARCADIO AGUILERA O.
The President.

ROMUALDO MORA P.,
The Secretary.

[Embossed seal of Republic of Panama.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, nothing can be more authoritarian or communistic than political ownership or control of human shelter. People willing to live in houses owned by any political unit, local, State, or Federal, become in the very nature of things pawns in the hands of politicians. The votes of persons occupying so-called low-rent housing, as provided in previous legislation and as proposed in the pending bill, can be almost tabulated before they are cast.

Testimony was given before the committee, as shown in the hearings—page 569—that Langdon W. Post, a regional director of the Federal Public Housing Administration on the west coast, in his book, Challenge of Housing, referred to public housing as a "new brand of political fruit which has enormous possibilities for exploitation."

Further, that Charles Abrams, while consultant to the United States Housing Authority, admitted in his book, Revolution in Land, that—

Public housing is a great field for political intrigue and offers many opportunities of personal advantage of the unscrupulous.

Further, that Mr. Abrams is still an aggressive proponent of public housing and frequently quoted by administration leaders in recent Senate debate, wrote in the New York Post, January 19, 1949:

The New York City Housing Authority looms as the big plum in the political orchard, and the politician who dominates the housing authority controls the city's political destiny.

Within a few years the families in housing projects will be nearly 10 percent of the city's total (that is New York City) and the investment of the authority will exceed $2,000,000,000 with all this means of construction contracts, patronage, and other rewards to the worthy. Selection of sites enables carving out blocks where hostile voters are numerous and then retenanting the project with those who vote right, while tenant relocation of vacant areas could change a whole neighborhood's political complexion overnight.

In my minority report on this measure I briefly describe a first-hand experience of my own with the sordid use to which this scheme is being put. That consisted of a brazen attempt in 1938—I was mayor of Marion, Ohio, and a prospective candidate for Congress at the time—to use a million dollars of taxpayers' money to buy outright the reelection of the incumbent Member of Congress from my district, in the guise of providing low-rent housing for poor people of that city.

This deceptively termed low-rent housing is the darling of the left-wing forces who are striving to substitute a politically planned and controlled economy for a natural or voluntary economy; for the supplanting of private laissez-faire with political laissez-faire, the private profit motive with the political profit motive, exchange of services effected by reciprocal self-interest which is the source of mutual justice and the very foundation of civilization with politically dictated exchange of services which is the basic device for plundering the producing group; in a word, the police or barbarian state for a contractual and civilized order.

This bill calls for the construction of 1,050,000 low-rent dwelling units which obligates the producers of the Nation in taxes to the amount of $16,000,000,000.

Proponents of this bill contend this sum would not be needed, that the amount of taxes actually required would not exceed more than two-thirds or three-quarters of the $16,000,000,000 (see majority report, p. 20). They base this claim on past experience in the financing of housing under the United States Housing Act of 1937. This is a spurious assumption. Only experience with this particular measure could possibly tell us whether or not all of the $16,000,000,000 would be needed. Since it would be necessary to appropriate $16,000,000,000 of taxes to provide a market for the securities to finance the construction of the projects common honesty demands that a like amount would have to be placed on the debit side of Treasury's ledger.

This is an ominous proposal even if the money cost did not exceed ten or twelve billion dollars considering the additional power the Federal political authority would acquire to that which it already exercises over practically all phases of the home-building industry, such as the provisioning of materials, construction, financing, cost, and so forth, of dwellings, and their disposition; the control over rental property which it exercises over about 14,000,000, or approximately one-third of all the dwelling units in the United States, which in effect has dispossessed their rightful owners of their title to them, such rights as remain being contingent rights and dependent upon existent and future political power; and, finally, bearing in mind that the producers of the necessaries of life are already bearing a tax burden that is annihilating risk capital, the very matrix of free enterprise and progress.

But what is even worse is the fact that passage of the pending bill would revive and give strong impetus to the program, which, according to its promoters envisions the construction of many millions of politically owned dwelling units at a

money cost so vast as to be beyond human comprehension and the absorption by the political profession of an enormity of economic power.

I have repeatedly stated that the United States Housing Act, of which H. R. 4009, is essentially but an extension, is a most deceptive and dishonest piece of legislation, and I now again so state. The designation "low-rent public housing" is a false designation. The houses built under the United States Housing Act of 1937 and those that would be constructed under title II of this bill can in no sense be considered as low-rent dwellings. The rents actually charged to the occupants may or may not be low in comparison with rents generally charged, but everyone knows that is not the whole story.

Assuming the testimony of the proponents of this measure with respect to the cost per dwelling unit is correct, the bill provides for subsidies amounting to an average of $380.95 per year per dwelling unit. And this does not take into consideration all of the subsidies. The fact is that instead of them being low-rent houses they are outrageously high-rent houses exceeding anything this Nation ever dreamed of. This will be better understood when it is realized that the average rent paid by tenant families in the United States in 1947 was only $352.

The principal spokesmen for political housing persist in reiterating that this falsely designated low-rent housing is available only to the lowest income group, that is, to slum dwellers and the poorest people generally. Mr. Thomas A. Danahey, former president of the Detroit Housing Commission, was an outstanding exception. He forthrightly stated the facts when he said:

> In the first place, it must be made clear that they will not be rented to slum residents or welfare clients. The tenants in these buildings will be people with definite minimum incomes and to be eligible to move in they must prove that their incomes are steady. There seems to be an impression that the slum residents are going to take the buildings over. Such is not the case.

Of course, it was no accident that the alleged definition in the law of eligibility was made just about as flexible as the average political promise. The scheme was deliberately devised to provide rental housing only for families having an income and credit rating so high as to disqualify slum dwellers and the poorest people generally from having access to it. There is more political spoliation to be had from housing families with substantial incomes than there is from housing the poorest people.

An outstanding example of the deception practiced to sustain the claim that this so-called low-rent housing is available only to slum dwellers, and the poorest people will be found in a publication entitled "The Seven Myths of Housing," written by Nathan Straus and published in 1944. Mr. Straus was formerly Administrator of the United States Housing Authority and one of the principal authors of the United States Housing Act of 1937. He also played a leading role in the writing of the amendments to the United States Housing Act contained in the pending measure, H. R. 4009. If you have any doubts about this, read his book, above referred to. In fact the same old crowd that contrived the United States Housing Act of 1937 and wheedled it through Congress is also the principal author of the pending bill and the main force behind its passage. Whoever has followed this movement can see Leon Keyserling, Vice Chairman of the President's so-called Council of Economic Advisers, sprawled all over it. On page 10 of Straus' work will be found a table showing that 92.4 percent of the families occupying so-called low-rent housing were from the lowest-income third. As will be seen in the footnote on the page above referred to, the classification of incomes was an arbitrary one devised by the United States Housing Authority under the direction of Mr. Straus himself, and showed the lowest-income third as less than $1,200.

Why did not Mr. Straus use the classification of incomes put out by the National Resources Planning Board which he says on page 225 of his book was "an organization of experts?" Simply because the picture would have been quite different than the one he painted.

Using that classification which gave $780 as top figure of the lowest income third, I showed in testimony given before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 24, 1939, page 13827, that only about 17 percent of the families eligible for occupying the dwellings in the projects from which I was able to obtain the pertinent information were from the lowest income group and those were from the uppermost part of it. More than 80 percent of the remainder had incomes in excess of those of the lower third, and some had incomes which put them in the top income third. I should mention that these data were worked up from material pertaining to eight housing projects in New York, Texas, and Florida. The housing authorities over these projects were the only ones from whom I was able to obtain this material, though I requested the same from many other local housing authorities.

One of the most blatant deceptions contained in the pending measure is that which attempts to make Members of Congress and the public believe that the source of funds for the construction of the housing projects would be different in kind if the local housing authority raised the money than would be the case if the Treasury provided it.

In section 204 we read under the caption "Private financing":

> SEC. 22. To facilitate the enlistment of private capital through the sale of public housing agencies of their bonds and other obligations to others than the Authority, in financing low-rent housing projects, and to maintain the low-rent character of housing projects.

Mr. Raymond M. Foley, Housing and Home Finance Administrator, accompanied by John Taylor Egan, Public Housing Commissioner, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, April 7, 1949, made the following statement:

> By various amendments to the financing provisions of the United States Housing Act, title II, would make it possible to carry out substantially all the permanent financing of projects through the sale of local housing authority bonds to private investors rather than through borrowing from the Federal Government.

The above provision in the pending measure and the statement of Mr. Foley are intended to imply that the funds obtained through the sale of bonds by the local housing authorities represent private capital, whereas the funds obtained by the Treasury through its issues do not represent private capital. Furthermore, the way the proponents of this measure put this proposition would convey the idea that the funds raised by local housing authorities would represent risk capital. Surely those not familiar with the procedures involved would be inclined to place these interpretations.

This is astounding, to say the least. Is there any other source from which funds can be obtained for the construction of any public building than that of private capital? And if the intention is to convey the impression that the private capital would be risk capital it is a fraud of the first order.

The procedures involved in financing the construction of this falsely designated low-rent housing are so beclouded by the intervention of the Federal Public Housing Administration, the so-called local housing authorities and annual Federal contributions as to make them obscure. Equivocation was necessary to promulgate some decidedly false beliefs. One of them is that local housing authorities are independent and locally owned entities, whereas they are owned de facto by the Federal political authority the same as post offices and other Federal structures, local housing authorities being but dummies of the Federal Public Housing Administration which is itself but an agency of the Federal political authority. Another is that the source for the financing of the housing projects is different in kind when securities are sold by the local housing authorities than would be the case if they were sold by the Treasury, which upon analysis will be shown to be wholly illusory. It is the Treasury that raises the money to pay the interest on and amortize the construction costs of the projects. In the final analysis, this bill, H. R. 4009, in unmistakable terms provides for the financing of the full cost of the housing to be built under it by the United States Treasury. There it is in the bill and will not be disputed by any person having respect for the truth.

It is to the United States Treasury that purchasers of bonds to finance the construction of the projects look for their interest and repayment of capital, not to the local housing authorities. Give to the provision in the bill pledging annual contributions amounting to $400,000,000 over a period of 40 years totaling $16,000,000,000 its proper designation by substituting the word appropriations for that of annual contributions

and it becomes clear that the procedure resolves itself into a Treasury transaction pure and simple.

The pending bill provides, page 35, beginning line 6—

> That in any event such annual contributions (appropriation) shall in each year be at least equal to an amount which, together with such income or other funds as are actually available from the project for the purpose at the time such annual contribution is made, will suffice for the payment of all installments, falling due within the next succeeding 12 months, of principal and interest on the obligations for which the annual contributions provided for in the contract shall have been pledged as security.

Mr. John Taylor Egan, Public Housing Commissioner, testified before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, as shown on page 62 of the hearings, that the cost of the 1,050,000 dwelling units proposed to be built under this bill would be approximately $8,900,000,000. On the basis of financing this cost at the going Federal rate of interest, 2½ percent, over the 40-year period, the $16,000,000,000 would more than meet such cost by approximately $800,000,000.

It is of the utmost importance to recognize the fact that the capital, $8,900,000,000, for constructing the projects would have to be raised by deficit financing, that the public debt would be increased by that amount, but that this would not appear on the Treasury statement. The debt would be hidden, which is accomplished by the ingenious device of issuing the bonds against the so-called local housing authorities instead of the Treasury. If a private person did a thing of the kind he would be sent to the penitentiary.

Because of its political character, this so-called low-rent housing scheme can by no stretch of the imagination be expected to eliminate the slums of the Nation because it does not remotely touch their cause. On the contrary, it can and it will have the effect of impoverishing the Nation and aggravating the very condition its proponents claim to cure. All history shows that politics is essentially a destructive force and tends ever toward the degradation of society and free enterprise, which is the one and only source of social and economic progress.

The funds for the construction of the dwellings would have to be expropriated out of private savings, which if left to those who created them would be used to benefit society. If confiscated, as H. R. 4009 provides, those savings, in the nature of things, would serve the interests of politicians and injure society.

This measure violates every equitable principle of taxation. Though it is unfair to taxpayers generally, the poorest people receive the unkindest cut of all. The latter, considering their economic status, bear a proportionately heavier burden of consumer and other taxes than do those who are eligible to occupy these politically owned houses. Out of their meager income the poorest people must pay tribute for the cost of constructing such dwellings, and to subsidize the rents of families with incomes higher than their own, some as high as $12,000. Notwithstanding, the poorest people are deprived from occupying those houses. Could anything be more antisocial and more heinous?

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. One thing that is brought out very clearly and is evidence everyone can understand is that these Public Housing Authority bonds are to be sold with a yield of 2 percent or less. A yield of 2 percent or less is only obtained from Government bonds. These are essentially Government bonds because the Federal Government pledges the annual contributions to be used by the Federal authority to pay the interest and to retire these local authority bonds. If the gentleman will look at the rate of 2 percent or less on these bonds, which it is anticipated the bonds will bear, he can see they must be Government bonds and can be nothing else.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I appreciate the contribution.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I notice the gentleman referred to the fact that the statement was made that possibly all of the money authorized by this bill might not be used and might not be required. Does the gentleman know of any instance since his service in the House, or before, when the Federal Government asked for an authorization, then did not use it?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It would be pretty hard to find an instance of that kind.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. For about 10 years we have been meeting every year, sometimes semiannually, and have voted money for housing which total many millions or billions of dollars I presume up to this time. I should like to know from the gentleman whether there is any collation in groupings that the gentleman can put in the RECORD to show how much we have appropriated during these years for this kind of work? Especially I am interested in the time when Mr. Wilson Wyatt was working on this proposition. A great fight was made at one time to give Mr. Wilson Wyatt wide opportunity, yet his program flunked out entirely. He went back to Louisville, from where he came. I would like to know when we are going to quit appropriating this money? The best way to determine that for me is to know how much we have appropriated.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Those figures are available and I think they could be put in the RECORD.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The Appropriations Committee is definitely bypassed on this bill, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. Only the administrative small amount of money may be appropriated by the Appropriations Committee, is that right?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. For administrative purposes. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman anticipate that interest on the bonds will ultimately have to be appropriated by the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Well, the $400,000,000, the so-called annual Federal contribution is an annual element of appropriation. Those are annual appropriations.

Mr. KUNKEL. But the Appropriations Committee is just as much obligated to make that appropriation as it is to make appropriations to pay the interest on the Federal debt because the credit of the United States Government is pledged for this as it is pledged back of all Government bonds.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is precisely so.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO].

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Chairman, we have known for a long time that this country faces a major problem of slums. Investigation after investigation has shown that our slums are growing and that our cities are running down hill.

Figures compiled by the Bureau of the Census show that over 5,000,000 families live in urban slum areas. The results of these conditions are twofold. Of first importance is the fact that the slums are draining our human resources—the most valuable asset of the Nation. Second, they are draining the lifeblood of our cities, threatening their solvency and preventing them from fulfilling their role in the national economy.

Take my own city of Newark, for example. In one slum area at least three out of every four dwelling units are in need of major repair or lack a private bath. The area has the highest rate of overcrowding in the city and over half of its housing accommodations are in structures built before 1900.

This is the section of the city which over a 5-year period had a record of 165 juvenile delinquents, compared with 1 for a corresponding area characterized by good housing conditions. Similarly, the mortality of infants less than a year old was at a rate of 36 in the slum area compared to 1 in the good residential section. Data on the incidence of tuberculosis, communicable disease, fire losses, crime, and other social ills follow similar patterns. It is not necessary to recite the details; they are the same for all cities the country over which have slum and blighted areas—and nearly all of them do. The figures merely high light the social losses in terms of human values that accompany bad housing and bad environmental conditions.

At the same time, these slum areas are a heavy financial drain upon municipal budgets. They cost a city far more for municipal services than they yield in tax revenues. I illustrate again from my

own city of Newark because I know it best. In 1946, the same slum area that I mentioned before cost the city about $380 per year per dwelling unit, which is the excess of expenditures over revenues on the average. The good area, on the other hand, netted the city some $420 in tax revenues over and above the cost of servicing that housing. The picture is the same if measured on a per capita basis. Data for other areas and other cities differ only in degree. The basic pattern is the same everywhere.

Clearly cities cannot continue to finance these deficit areas indefinitely and remain solvent. Their progressive decay must be arrested and reversed as promptly as possible. Further delay only means that the slums to be cleared will be larger, the local resources for the clearance job will be diminished further, and the losses to business, to Government, and more especially to the people both within and without slum areas will be increased. Because of the size of the job and the length of time it will take, a start must be made as soon as possible.

There is one point I should like to make clear in connection with urban redevelopment. Although decent homes should be provided for present slum dwellers, it does not necessarily follow that slum areas should be redeveloped with public housing. On the contrary, there is good reason to believe that a large part of these areas can be redeveloped by private enterprise and this is the principle behind title I of H. R. 4009.

For several reasons, slum land costs too much for private enterprise to acquire it, clear off the old buildings, and redevelop it in line with the most desirable uses. Under this legislation public funds would be made available for the acquisition, clearance, and the replanning of these areas. The land then would be made available for redevolpment at prices commensurate with its new use, with the loss from this operation being absorbed by Government. The Federal Government would assist local communities in two ways. First, it would provide repayable loans, up to $1,000,000,000 over a 5-year period, to enable the local communities to finance slum acquisition, clearance, and replanning. Then it would provide grants, not to exceed $500,000,000, over a 5-year period, to share with the local communities, on a 2-to-1 basis, the loss which they would incur in acquiring and clearing the land and making it available for redevelopment at prices which would be attractive to private enterprise and in line with sound reuse of the land.

The Joint Committee on Housing found that, if anything was to be done to clear up these slums, the Federal Government would have to assist the local communities. The best evidence is that, although urban redevelopment legislation exists in half of our States, it is largely inoperative because of the lack of adequate funds. Even where a start has been made, as in Detroit, city officials have testified that they will be unable to go beyond the present limited program because of lack of financial resources. According to a subcommittee report, 42 out of 45 mayors in States having urban redevelopment legislation said that Federal assistance would be necessary. The 2-to-1 matching basis for grants was arrived at as probably the most equitable formula in consideration of the mutuality of interest and the respective financial abilities of the Federal Government and the localities.

H. R. 4009 recognizes the close relationship which exists between slum clearance and housing, although the two programs are actually separate. The bill obligates local communities to assure the availability of adequate housing for all families who will be displaced by slum clearance. It is specific in requiring that temporary housing and eventually permanent housing, which is decent, safe, and sanitary, be provided for all these families, including those belonging to minority groups, at rents and prices they can afford to pay and accessible to their places of employment. This is the link which joins the slum-clearance and housing programs. It calls for a statesmanlike approach to the urban-redevelopment problem on the part of the local communities. It will involve reliance in some cases on public housing, in the redevelopment areas or elsewhere, to meet the needs of the lowest income families. It will call for reexamination of the plans for the locality's development to fit the required rehousing into the over-all pattern of the community. This will be especially necessary in cities like Newark, for example, where vacant sites are scarce and expansion of the urban area is difficult.

Obviously, to do this planning and to meet these requirements, without causing undue housing hardship to displaced families, will take time. Also time-consuming is the process of land acquisition—another step that must be taken before actual rebuilding of blighted areas can take place. We all know that this job must be done and H. R. 4009 makes available the wherewithal for getting started. The aids it provides will not do the whole job but it does permit a beginning to be made and the time for that beginning is already long overdue.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, poverty is a disease that destroys orderly government. Emperors and kings, lords and dictators have fallen under the impact of poverty. But this cancerous growth does not attack only kings and emperors; Fascist and Communist governments as well as republics and democracies fall prey to its disastrous effects. So I welcome this debate. America recognizes the disease of poverty and its implications. The debate in this House I hope will bestir the people of our Nation to action.

The great issue, Mr. Chairman, is not, shall it be done; the great issue is, how shall it be done.

This bill offers one plan by which an attack may be made. There may be other plans, but this, Mr. Chairman, is the bill which we are debating today.

Speakers before me have outlined generally the contents of the bill, so I will not take a great deal of time, Mr. Chairman, in analyzing the various sections of the bill. In passing, however, I do want to comment on the slum clearance provision. As mentioned here before, this morning, the slum clearance provision of the bill will permit localities to clear the slum areas not only within the municipality, but the periphery of the municipal limits areas may be cleared and may be held by the city, not only in fee simple, but in perpetuity and those areas may be leased for time without end.

So, these slum areas may or may not be redeveloped as gentlemen preceding me have said, into low-rent housing units.

Another very interesting thing in connection with the clearance of slums came to light in our committee. As an illustration I want to point out the so-called slum area known as Marshall Heights nearby Washington. Marshall Heights has been cited as an example for slum clearance. I understand that Marshall Heights is inhabited by colored people. These people own their homes, or at least a large percentage of them do. A large percentage of them, with their own hands, built homes upon the land which they had purchased with their meager savings. These people have added stick by stick and stone by stone and with the toil of their own hands built homes so that they might have a place to live. Now well-meaning people are saying that we must clear these slums. They may not meet certain standards of safety or sanitation, but these people have a pride in the ownership of their particular homes.

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

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. It is a curious coincidence that I came into the chamber holding in my hand the proof sheets of the hearings before the subcommittee on independent offices appropriations on Marshall Heights, in which not only is what the gentleman saying admitted by representatives of the local planning commission, but it is also admitted that what would happen is that either these residents who own their own property would be pushed farther and farther out, or they would be required to take the $150 or the several hundred dollars which they would get through condemnation proceedings and apply that on a new home as a first payment and then have a large mortgage. That is what they would have in exchange for private ownership under the American system.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

In that connection, remember that these are colored people. These people must find homes in which to live in Washington or nearby. It is not an easy thing, once you restrict them or take from colored people an area in which they are living, to find a place for them.

One other phase of the bill I want to discuss briefly is the farm-home proposition. You know that this bill provides for loans for farm homes. It provides for loans to those farmers who have an adequate farm but do not have enough cash on hand with which to build a house if they find themselves living in unsafe or unsanitary homes. So we provide a

loan for 33 years at 4 percent interest. But the second provision is that the farmer who is operating a potentially adequate farm may borrow money if it is found that this potentially adequate farm can be made an adequate farm—how? By adding to it, if you please, or by buying other land or through improved farming practices. The point in that connection being that the Secretary of Agriculture, if a farmer does borrow money, may then contract with that individual and tell him how he must farm that land for the next 10 years; tell him what he can plant, what farm practices he must follow. In fact, the Secretary of Agriculture will entirely control the operation of that farm.

In addition to that, the Secretary of Agriculture may credit against the loan all of the interest payments, may cancel half of the yearly principal payments, and, in addition, grant a moratorium for such length of time as he may deem necessary.

One other plan is provided in connection with the farmhouses. Five hundred dollars is proposed to be given to about 50,000 farmers in this country. For what is that $500 to be given to them? A hand-out to be given to those farmers to buy screens, to put a roof on their home, to build an inside Chic Sales instead of an outside Chic Sales, to do other things necessary to improve the farm which, under the terms of this bill, is not adequate, is not even potentially adequate, and which has no possibility whatsoever of becoming adequate.

So I say that this farm section of the bill provides for an uneconomic, unsocial advancement of the situation in the farm areas which is not at all proper.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I might note in passing that some of the greatest men of our country have lived under circumstances where they did not have all of these modern facilities. There are a couple of things that I would like the gentleman to explain. One is this: We have had tens of thousands of G. I.'s and others who have purchased homes at anywhere from $8,000 to $15,000. Do they get any subsidies under this bill?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. No.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So they are excluded?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Yes.

Now, I want to proceed to the low-rent housing feature, because the low-rent housing feature after all is the real issue in this case.

The Federal Government provides loans to local housing authorities to build residences. Those residences are leased to tenants whose average income is $175 a month. A tenant, in order to qualify, must live in an unsafe home or an insanitary home, or an overcrowded home, or must not have any home at all, or must be about to be put out of the home without any fault of his own, or he must be living in a home which will be destroyed by a slum-clearance or a low-rent housing area. Those are the qualifications of tenants in the low-rent housing units. The tenant pays whatever amount he can afford to pay, based upon his income. I say "based upon his income." It is based upon his net income after certain deducts are permitted. That income need not be by the labor of the tenant. He may be the recipient of an inheritance of $75,000, and receive $1,875 a year, and he could live in these low-rent units.

The Federal Government pays the local authority the difference between what the tenant can pay and the economic rent. In other words, the difference between what it costs to operate the low-rent housing unit, the amortization of the debt, and what the tenant pays.

For the following reasons I object to the low-rent housing plan:

The first objection is that it is privileged and discriminatory housing.

Secondly, it will not clear the slums.

Third, the poorer folks will not be housed under this program.

Fourth, it builds a tremendous political machine.

Fifth, it violates the rights of the minorities.

Sixth, it is excessive in cost, and there are no brakes on the excessive cost.

Seventh, it tends to destroy private homes and private business.

And eighth, it tends to destroy our form of government.

In this country there are approximately 6,100,000 families living in substandard homes—6,100,000 families, if you please. In addition, 300,000 families are living, according to Mr. Foley, the Federal Housing Administrator, in overcrowded homes. This bill will provide, after the compromise which I understand has been agreed to, for 810,000 homes. So about one out of six or seven families in this country are to receive this privileged home. I say, what are you going to do about the other five or six? Are we going to now say that they must be housed? And if so, let us be honest about it. Let us not talk about this bill costing five billions or ten billions. For if we house all those people, the cost will run into the hundreds of billions. Let us find out exactly where we are going. Let us not talk about housing even 1,000,000 families or 2,000,000 families, or 4,000,000 families. Here are 6,500,000 families. Are we going to house them? The proponents should let us know about it and tell the truth about this.

It is discriminatory as to areas, States, and municipalities which will not be able to come under the terms of the bill. Right now in Miami, Fla., there are more low-rent public-housing units than there are in Kansas City or St. Louis; there are none in my State of Kansas. As you follow the operation of the present law you will find that that situation is true over the country; that not only in States, in counties, in cities, but even on the same street there are inequalities. John Jones living right next to Pete Smith, receiving exactly the same amount of income, living in exactly the same sort of house, living in an overcrowded, unsafe, insanitary home, tries to get into a public-housing unit but is unable to. Why? Because Pete Smith beat him to it, and because Pete Smith knew somebody who helped him out, so Pete Smith gets the low-rent public-housing unit. And John Jones pays part of Pete Smith's rent.

Secondly, this will not clear the slums. Remember, this program provides for two separate and distinct projects. The first is a slum-clearance project that has nothing whatsoever to do with low-rent housing. As a matter of fact, the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who preceded me have said that; they have said they would clear the slums, but that low-rent houses probably would not be built on the cleared area, that probably they will want to build the low-rent houses elsewhere; and that is exactly what is happening and has happened. The people who are interested in this bill are the people who are interested in building low-rent houses for their own purposes and not for the purpose of clearing slums.

The Washington metropolitan area has built 240 low-rent housing projects since 1935, 66,597 apartments; yet the slum dwellings and the alley dwellings that were here in 1935 are here today; the same pictures that were taken in 1935 to prove that we needed to house the dwellers of the slums were used before our committee to show our committee that we should house the dwellers of these slums. "Nineteen billion dollars and 7 years from now we shall see those in the Washington slums will be doing business at the same old stand," says Harold Taylor, in Barron's National Weekly. I ask: Why not require these people to eliminate a comparable slum unit at the same time that they build a low-rent public housing unit? I am answered that if that were done the people whose homes were demolished would have no place to live. It does not need to be done at the same time, but you can exact a guaranty or a contract that if a municipality enters into a low-rent housing project they must within a reasonable time in the future eliminate and eradicate slums. Will those people who want this bill agree to such an amendment? No. Why not? Because they are interested in only one thing, and that thing is to obtain the benefits, politically and otherwise, which are obtainable through low-rent public housing.

The poorer folk, the people who are in the lowest bracket of income, will not be benefited by this bill. The average income of the occupants of these low-rent housing units is $1,875 per year. I refer you to page 67 of the hearings. It is conceded that the lowest income families have little opportunity to enter into these low-rent housing units; as a matter of fact, it is families receiving less than $1,000 a year who are now living in slums who need this housing, but not more than 6, 7, or at most 9 percent of them will have a chance to take advantage of the low-rent public housing. So it is not a housing program for the poor of America.

This bill builds a tremendous political machine. I am not exactly sure what the percentage of the population is that voted at the last election, but we all know it was a small percentage. We also know, Mr. Chairman, that any group which controls a small minority, if it is a compact group, is able to drive through

their political machine to any sort of victory if they care to do so.

Here are some of the statements that have been made in connection with the political implications of the public-housing bill. Mr. Charles Abrams, who has been quoted here before, today writes in the Post Home News Housing Authority, refers to the New York Housing Authority, a part of which is controlled by Republicans. He is not talking about Democrats, and when I say the bill will build up a political machine, I do not mean necessarily it might build a Democratic machine any more than it might build a Republican political machine. He says that the Housing Authority in New York looms as a big plum in the political orchard, and the politician who dominates the Housing Authority controls the political destiny of that city.

What else is said in connection with this matter? Mr. Post, whose book the gentleman from Ohio quoted a moment ago, said:

> This last plum is a new brand of political fruit which has enormous possibilities for exploitation. Imagine the golden opportunities latent in a $500,000,000 housing program in New York City. Commissions, profits, fees, jobs, and finally, apartments for at least 200,000 voters. It is a bonanza beyond the wildest dreams of the most optimistic politician.

Mr. Chairman, this bill tends to destroy private homes and private business. The other night I had the pleasure of appearing on a radio forum before an audience and I made the statement that this bill tends to destroy private homes and private enterprise and I got a few boos. But if you analyze what happens in connection with this bill you will find it does tend to destroy private homes. Why? It takes from the people the desire to live in a private home, it saddles a huge tax upon them, and as these burdens pile one upon the other, finally, those people who have been careful and have attempted to save, so that they might have their own homes, will find those homes disappear.

In addition to that, there is this further thought: If we house the 1,050,000 people, provided for in this bill, why do we not house the others? There are other people, 20 percent of the population, receiving less than $1,600 per year. If we house the 1,050,000 families, why not house the rest of them? When we finally do that the snowball has rolled on down the hill until it engulfs everybody in the whole of the United States.

Then finally, Mr. Chairman, it tends to destroy our Government. I am not one who says this bill is socialistic or that it is communistic. But a very interesting thing is that in 1928, before either the Democratic or Republican Parties thought about it, the Communist Party of America included public housing in its political platform. Today the Soviet Government has in its constitution, article 6, a provision that the homes of the laboring people shall belong to the state.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, it is rather sloppy thinking to object to this proposal by merely saying it is socialism and let it go at that; on the other hand I think it is sloppy thinking for the other side to say, well we are doing many other things which may be socialism, so why not pile this on top of the other? Unless we can point out what this proposal does, then we should not charge that it is socialism. Remember, as we continue to advance Government ownership, as we continue political control, and as we continue the excessive tax burden, there is a very definite possiblity that the way of life we have known in this great Republic will disappear. I think that is something for us, in our more sober moments, to consider when we vote upon this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote briefly from another Kansan, General Eisenhower, upon that subject, who said:

> Because the kind of dictatorship under which we may fall today is not that brought off by means of a coup d'etat and a suddenly seized power by using the Army and Navy and guns to put us all in a strait-jacket. There is a kind of dictatorship that can come about through a creeping paralysis of thought, readiness to accept paternalistic measures from the Government, and those paternalistic measures are accompanied by a surrender of our own responsibility.

Now, there is a slender, almost indistinguishable thread running through this entire bill. That thread is Government control of the individual family life, the individual home, the individual. Read the bill carefully from the beginning, the declaration of policy, through the slum-clearance proposition, through the low-rent plan, down through the research program and, finally, to the farm housing, in which the farmers are regimented, and you will then find, Mr. Chairman, that this thread may become so strong as to strangle the people of America.

People have said, "You object to the bill. Do you have an alternative?" Yes, Mr. Chairman; I have an alternative. America has become great because we are a Republic designed by our forefathers. This Republic became great because the Government gave to the people the tools with which to do the job for themselves, not to be dependent upon the bounty of a paternalistic Government.

The civic clubs of America, the churches of America, and the labor unions of America, the real-estate people, all classes, even the Congressmen, have a duty and a responsibility to meet this problem of poverty and disease. Yet it must be met in such a fashion that the people will not be throttled; that they may not lose their heritage.

So, Mr. Chairman, we do have a responsibility. We do have an opportunity, but that opportunity does not require us to yield to the Government the homes of our Nation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I noted that my distinguished colleague who just preceded me, by a slip of the tongue, referred to "dwell slummers." I do not know whether he meant "swell slums" or "swell drummers," and I am sure an analysis of his speech will not show that either. It will show, however, that he has given to you today every argument that has been urged upon us by every lobbyist against the bill including the real-estate boards, the chambers of commerce, and all of those vested interests that do not want anything done to clear our country of its slums and do not want anything done to provide the lowest income groups of our country with decent places in which to live.

One of the arguments you heard a moment ago was that public housing is political housing, and he quoted, or purported to quote, from the remarks of a gentleman who writes for the New York Post. That misquotation, deliberate or otherwise, has been rampant ever since the Senate began its hearings on the bill we are now considering. I placed in the record of the hearings before our committee a complete answer to that misquotation. The statement was attributed to Mr. Charles Abrams of the New York Post. The answer appears at pages 392 and 393 of the hearings conducted before our committee. I placed in the RECORD today a letter from Mr. Abrams which is a complete refutation of the charge that he or anyone else has ever referred to public housing as political housing.

The fact of the matter is that in the State of New York we have two different public housing authorities. In the city of New York, which is controlled by the Democrats, we have a very fine housing authority. No one has charged it with running any of its projects political-wise, or attempting to fill it with tenants or persons who vote as members of the Democratic Party. Statewide we have the New York State housing authority, controlled by the Republicans. There, too, no one would dare point a finger of accusation and say they are trying to fill their projects with persons who vote as Republicans.

It should be perfectly obvious that this is a bipartisan measure. The men who are supporting it in both Houses are good Americans. They are not Socialists or Communists. They are liberal-minded men with the interests of their country at heart.

Mr. Chairman, one of the principal arguments advanced by the opposition against this bill is that it is a big-city bill. They say that this bill will benefit only the big metropolitan areas.

Actually, the bill includes specific language which provides a tested, and an administratively sensible, means of assuring that the benefits will not be so confined. The bill specifically provides that not more than 10 percent of the funds provided, either for slum clearance or for low-rent public housing, shall be expended in any one State. The opposition deliberately ignores all past experience under a similar limitation in the 1937 legislation. They actually attempt to use this limitation as an argument for the proposition that the entire benefits of the slum clearance and the public housing titles of the bill will be confined

to 10 large cities in 10 large States. For example, in response to a question during the hearings before the Committee on Rules, the ranking minority member of the House Banking and Currency Committee said that the benefits of this bill would go primarily to 10 large cities in 10 large States.

Mr. Chairman, this contention is manifestly inconsistent with the plain facts of previous experience.

I will now answer that charge.

The specific provisions of title II of the bill requires that 10 percent of each amount of annual contributions authorizations becoming available must be reserved for a period of 3 years for use with respect to projects to be located in rural nonfarm areas.

Let us evaluate, against past experience, the current charge that this bill will benefit only 10 big cities. It is often said that there is little new in the world, and perhaps that is true here. The United States Housing Act, which first provided for low-rent public housing, was under consideration by the House of Representatives 12 years ago. On page 9244 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 18, 1937, there appears the following colloquy:

Mr. WOLCOTT. It [the bill] has two purposes. The elimination of the slums, and the providing of low-rent housing for people who would otherwise have to live in the slums.

Mr. MAY. How many cities would really be materially affected?

Mr. WOLCOTT. New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Detroit, Chicago, and quite a number of points west.

So you see that 12 years ago the same contention was being made that this kind of legislation benefits only the big cities. But what has been the experience under that earlier legislation? Let me tell you.

Under that 1937 legislation, there are at present a total of 268 localities with low-rent public housing projects, only 72 or 27 percent are in large cities. One hundred and ninety-six of those 268 projects—more than 70 percent of the total—are in localities having a population of less than 100,000. There are 7 in localities having a population of less than 2,500. Thirty-six are in localities having a population between 2,500 and 10,000. Sixty-one are in localities having a population of from 10,000 to 25,000, and 92 in localities having a population of from 25,000 to 100,000.

Here are the names of just a few of the big metropolitan cities in which low-rent public housing projects have been made available under that 1937 legislation: Fairfield and Tarrant, Ala.; Glendale and Mesa, Ariz.; Conway, Ark.; Antioch and Martinez, Calif.; Sanford, Fla.; Albany, Ga.; East Moline and Madison, Ill.; Frankfort, Ky.; Annapolis and Frederick, Md.; Biloxi, Miss.; Fayetteville, N. C.; Ambridge and Wayne, Pa.; Baytown, Tex.; Hopewell, Va.; Black Diamond and Port Angeles, Wash.; Martinsburg and Mount Hope, W. Va.

Is that big-city legislation? You will find the same limitations in the bill we are considering now.

I ask the Members of the House to remember that the same argument that is currently being advanced against this bill was made 12 years ago in 1937. I ask you to judge the merit of this argument that this is a big city bill by the actual experience and the facts which I have just cited.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I have before me at the moment a communication from the American Municipal Association, dated June 20, 1949, urging the enactment of this legislation. Here are the big cities that want this legislation and the names of their mayors who urge it:

Allentown, Pa.: Hon. Donald V. Hock, mayor.
Atlanta, Ga.: Hon. W. B. Hartsfield, mayor.
Augusta, Ga.: Hon. W. D. Jennings, mayor.
Bethlehem, Pa.: Hon. Robert Pfeifle, mayor.
Biloxi, Miss.: Hon. G. B. Cousins, Jr., mayor.
Cambridge, Mass.: John B. Atkinson, city manager.
Camden, N. J.: Hon. George E. Brunner, mayor.
Chattanooga, Tenn.: Hon. Hugh P. Wasson, mayor.
Cincinnati, Ohio: Hon. Albert D. Cash, mayor.
Columbia, S. C.: Hon. Frank C. Owens, mayor.
Corpus Christi, Tex.: Hon. Leslie Wasserman, mayor.
Denver, Colo.: Hon. Quigg Newton, mayor.
Detroit, Mich.: Hon. Eugene I. Van Antwerp, mayor.
Durham, N. C.: Hon. Dan K. Edwards, mayor.
Flint, Mich.: Hon. George G. Wills, mayor.
Gary, Ind.: Hon. Eugene H. Swartz, mayor.
Hartford, Conn.: Hon. Cyril Coleman, mayor.
Hoboken, N. J.: Hon. Fred DeSapio, mayor.
Kansas City, Mo.: Hon. William E. Kemp, mayor.
Lackawanna, N. Y.: Hon. John J. Janega, mayor.
Los Angeles, Calif.: Hon. Fletcher Bowron, mayor.
Louisville, Ky.: Hon. Charles P. Farnsley, mayor.
Madison, Wis.: Leonard G. Howell, city manager.
Memphis, Tenn.: Hon. Watkins Overton, mayor.
Miami, Fla.: Hon. Robert L. Floyd, mayor.
Milwaukee, Wis.: Hon. Frank P. Zeidler, mayor.
Minneapolis, Minn.: Hon. Eric G. Hoyer, mayor.
New Haven, Conn.: Hon. William C. Celentano, mayor.
New Orleans, La.: Hon. deLesseps S. Morrison, mayor.
New York, N. Y.: Hon. William O'Dwyer, mayor.
Norfolk, Va.: C. A. Harrell, city manager.
Oakland, Calif.: Hon. Joseph E. Smith, mayor.
Passaic, N. J.: Hon. Paul G. Demuro, mayor.
Paterson, N. J.: Hon. Michael U. DeVita, mayor.
Richmond, Va.: Hon. W. Stirling King, mayor.
Rockford, Ill.: Hon. C. H. Bloom, mayor.
St. Joseph, Mo.: Hon. Henry D. Allison, mayor.
St. Louis, Mo.: Hon. Joseph M. Darst, mayor.
St. Paul, Minn.: Hon. Edward K. Delaney, mayor.
Seattle, Wash.: Hon. William F. Devin, mayor.
Stockton, Calif.: Hon. Angelo Sanguinetti, mayor.
Syracuse, N. Y.: Hon. Frank P. Costello, mayor.
Toledo, Ohio: Hon. Michael V. DiSalle, mayor.
Waterbury, Conn.: Hon. Raymond E. Snyder, mayor.
Wichita, Kans.: Hon. William C. Salome, Jr., mayor.
York, Pa.: Hon. Felix S. Bentzel, mayor.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know and care less whether they are Democrats or Republicans. They speak for 45 cities in 27 States. Calling them Communists will not defeat this bill. Only four of these cities can be classified as among the larger cities of the country. Yet this bill is labeled big-city legislation.

New York City and New York State want this legislation, but if they do not get it, they are going to get along without it.

But here is what you will be missing. I have in my hand the current report, the fifteenth annual report, covering the year 1949, of the New York City Housing Authority. You talk about taking property off the tax rolls and depleting the income of States and municipalities. Here is the result of 15 years of experience in the city of New York on these projects. I quote from the report:

Again in 1948 the public-housing program proved a good investment for the taxpayer. Despite the fact that partial tax exemption remains one of the chief ways by which the public supports the program, public housing does pay a considerable part of its own way. A record $2,281,167 in taxes and payments in lieu of taxes was returned to New York City by the housing authority in 1948. That sum represents one-fifth again as much as the city collected on the same property before it was acquired for public housing.

That means a 20-percent increase in tax revenue to the city, the State, or the Nation which is brought about by clearing your slums and housing those who cannot afford it. That is a mighty good financial investment quite apart from all that goes along with these projects in eliminating juvenile delinquency and decreasing crime and improving the health standards of our country.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that there is no need for this bill, and that there is no need for any low-rent public housing. The real-estate lobby contends that it is not needed because private enterprise can and will meet the housing needs of all our people.

I do not for 1 minute believe, nor do I believe that the Members of the House believe, that this is anything but the rankest sort of propaganda on the part of the real-estate lobby. I do not think that the members of the real-estate lobby themselves believe it. There is plenty of evidence that they do not.

Again, let us evaluate, against past experience, this current claim that private enterprise can and will provide adequate housing for low-income families who now live in the slums. Let us go back, for just a moment, to 10 years ago. Let us look at the hearings on the 1939 amendments to the National Housing Act. On page 156 of the printed hearings of the House Banking and Currency Committee on H. R. 3232, Seventy-sixth Congress, you will find some evidence of whether the members of the real-estate

lobby really believe this claim that private enterprise can and will provide adequate housing for low-income families who now live in the slums.

Let me say here it matters not whether the public-housing project goes onto the identical land where you remove the slum. It is enough benefit to the entire community if you wipe out the slum. It matters not whether the new public-housing project goes there or in a better location.

You will find an interesting exchange between the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the executive director of the United States Savings and Loan League, Morton Bodfish, one of the most blatant spokesmen for the real-estate lobby. Mr. PATMAN asked Mr. Bodfish if he was familiar with a certain publication put out by the United States Savings and Loan League. Mr. Bodfish replied that he was familiar with it, and that it was "an advertising appeal" to savings and loan institutions suggesting how they might best spend their advertising dollars.

It is there in the printed record for all to see. That little "advertising suggestion," put out by the United States Savings and Loan League, said:

> Who is your market? (People make markets.) The "top half" families make the best market. What are "top half" families? "Top half" families are families with incomes over $1,446 per year, and the "bottom half" families are families of incomes less than $1,446 per year. * * *
>
> The "top half" comprises 50 percent of the United States families and 70 percent of the buying power. The "top half" spends 63.7 percent of all money spent for shelter.
>
> Housing loans are your business. Savings are your business.
>
> How about the lower half? It's a market you don't want. * * * Food and shelter alone eat up 74.6 percent of their incomes. They can't save. They can't buy homes. So forget the bottom half.

Now that is a very frank and candid statement. Bear in mind that this document is an admonition to lending institutions as to how they might best spend their advertising dollars. It says that these families with incomes of $1,446 per year in 1939 cannot save money and cannot buy homes. It therefore says—very frankly and as a straightforward business proposition—that lending institutions should not invest their time, energy, or advertising dollars on families in the lower half of the income group—families with annual incomes of less than $1,446.

Today, it would take about $2,500 to buy what $1,446 bought in 1939. So Mr. Bodfish of the United States Savings and Loan League has been telling the lending institutions to forget about families with incomes of $2,500 and less—they cannot save money and they cannot buy homes.

Let us evaluate, against this very candid, business proposition of one of the recognized spokesmen of the real-estate lobby, the contention that private enterprise can and will provide adequate housing for families of low income and that public housing therefore is not needed. Let us see how this compares with the annual incomes of the families actually served under the present low-rent housing program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

The real-estate-lobby spokesman today, Mr. Bodfish, says frankly as a straightforward business proposition that lending institutions should not invest their time, energy, or advertising dollars on families in the lower half of the income group, families with an income of less than $1,446 of 10 years ago and less than $2,500 of today. That very candid business proposition indicates to you, as it does to me, I am sure, that the contention that private enterprise can and will provide adequate housing for families of low income cannot withstand analysis.

When you make a comparison of the figures, when you realize that these people who are earning $2,500 a year or less today in the larger communities and $1,500 a year or less in the smaller communities, cannot possibly compete with those who are in the market, who are willing to buy houses that are being built today and being sold at excessive prices. They cannot possibly compete for homes in the new multiple-dwellings that are being put up by private industry.

In the city of New York today you cannot rent in a new building for less than $40 per room, and that means $120 a month for a 3-room apartment. There are no people who will benefit by this legislation who can possibly hope to ever get into that kind of a dwelling. Private enterprise in the city of New York and elsewhere in the country will never erect or spend their own money to erect buildings for the lowest income group that is going to be taken care of by this legislation.

If you will look at page 58 of the printed hearings on H. R. 4009 before the House Banking and Currency Committee, you will find that the maximum income limits set by local housing authorities for admission to low-rent public housing average 36 percent less than the minimum adequate budget covering the essentials of life in various cities for families of the same size, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. You will find that, during the first 6 months of 1948, the median income of all families admitted to low-rent public housing was $1,481. You will find that the median income of all tenants reexamined during that period was $1,884. You will find that the median income of all families eligible to continue to reside in low-rent public housing projects was $1,594. You will find that the average of the maximum income limits established for admission to low-rent public housing projects was $1,974, and, as indicated above, that the average incomes of the families actually admitted was almost $400 below that maximum.

Under these circumstances — and especially in view of the admonition of a recognized spokesman for the real-estate lobby that lenders should forget about families in the bottom half of the income scale—does there exist any factual basis for believing that private enterprise can or will, in the foreseeable future, provide a substantial supply of adequate housing for such families? Does there really exist any basis, founded in fact instead of in fancy or propaganda, for the charge that public housing competes with private housing—that it takes away from private enterprise families who otherwise would be its customers? Is there any basis for believing that, if we do not pass this bill, there is any real prospect that families with incomes in these levels and who now live in the slums can and will obtain adequate housing?

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that every Member of the House knows the honest answer to those questions, and I urge them to support this bill.

The argument advanced that only the high-income groups will get the advantage of this legislation and be able to move into these projects is untrue. It is some more of the same misleading propaganda that has been dished out to us.

Incidentally, I heard one of our colleagues say a little earlier in the day something about not having received any propaganda against this bill, that all he had been getting was the other way. I think most of you have been receiving any number of pamphlets like those which came in today's mail, expensive pamphlets, 2-color, 3-color, and 4-color jobs of 15 pages and more—here is one of 4 pages printed in 3 colors—and any number of other items indicative of the tremendous amount of money that the real-estate lobby and those associated with it are spending to defeat this legislation. I am sure that we are not going to be misled by this propaganda.

You have been told time and time again that the people who want this legislation are the finest and the most outstanding, and the most respected and respectable members of our community and its public life. I am certain that few of my colleagues will be ashamed to take their place with me alongside of the following "Socialists" and "Communists" who are supporting this legislation and I name now only a few of those who have written me urging enactment of this legislation. They are as follows:

The United States conference of mayors, which again at their 1949 annual conference unanimously adopted the resolutions urging enactment of this legislation.

The American Legion.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The League of Women Voters of the United States.

The National Conference of Catholic Charities.

The American Institute of Planners.

The City of Pontiac (Mich.) Housing Commission.

The Commission of the City of Miami, Fla.

The Municipal Housing Commission of Paducah, Ky.

The City Council of the City of Biloxi, Miss.

The Manchester Housing Authority of Manchester, N. H.

The Citizens Union of the City of New York.

The Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York.

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

The Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, of the United States of America.

The League of Women Voters of the City of New York.

The National Association of Jewish Center Workers.

The Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

The Central Labor Council of Seattle, Wash.

The American Federation of Labor.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations, and almost every other labor union and brotherhood in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we are here today seeking a solution for one of the most harassing problems facing this country: Housing. It is not confined to the few big cities but is spread across the country from sea to sea, from Canada to the Rio Grande and the Gulf of Mexico.

The concentration of population in cities, the shifting of vast numbers of people from one State to another as great new factories have made their demands for workers, the relative absence of housing construction during the war years, the lack of foresight on the part of those responsible, combined with the original sudden return of millions of troops without preparation for their reception, has built a situation which challenges our resourcefulness as it has never been challenged. Solution must be found—an American solution—which will continue our unique way of life, protecting the individual, the community, and the State from the domination and control of a central government. I cannot believe that we have fallen away so far from sound thinking that we cannot work out such a formula. Nor can you convince me that it is impossible to set up ways to use Federal money to help local communities without clamping down Federal controls.

I still believe in the American way of life, Mr. Chairman. I still believe that there is no need to use the formulas of socialism to meet the needs of our people, and I confess I cannot agree with the insistence of some that any and all uses of Federal funds for local needs is socialism.

No thoughtful American today can fail to be concerned over the centralization of power that has been brought about coupled as it has been with undisciplined financial methods. No thoughtful American—and I contend, Mr. Chairman, there are many on both sides of the aisle—can fail to recognize the need of protecting such liberties as we still have from Federal intrusions and of reestablishing a freedom in which justice and opportunity for all, the rights of the individual and of free enterprise are recognized essentials.

Looking to the future we have set up programs and appropriated funds for flood control, for defense reorganization, for the conservation of the soil and of wildlife. I cannot believe we are so materially minded that we fail to see our responsibility in the matter of assuring our people decent homes in which children can grow into a strong and healthy citizenship. They are the future of America—without them of what moment is all the rest? And they have the right to expect us as intelligent Americans to keep those homes free from the autocratic controls of centralized power and so continuing the basic concept of our Republic.

The housing needs of our people are very real—private enterprise as such has not been able to meet them. In my opinion, there is no justification for an assumption that private industry alone is responsible for the tragic needs of our lowest-income group. Do we expect private industry to construct an adequate supply of low-rent housing at a loss? Surely it is the responsibility of every American to do his bit in caring for the housing of the indigent and those unable to care for themselves wherever they may be. This can be done through properly restricted use of Federal funds which, after all, come from all the people.

Let me say further, Mr. Chairman, that no one is more deeply concerned than I over the unsound and extravagant use of funds that has brought us to a most dangerous financial position. But I am convinced that merely to ignore the needs of our people because of the money involved is exceedingly poor economy. I am convinced that an investment in meeting the human need of our own people will prove to be good economy.

The Hoover Commission reports are in. They point out in no uncertain terms possibilities of retrenchments in Government expenditures of several billions of dollars not by curtailing desirable work but by instituting efficient methods of procedure. Think of it, $1,500,000,000 savings just in one part of one department by proper accounting methods alone. Have we not as representatives of the people the obligation to insist that these reforms be instituted? I am not speaking of reorganization as such, of the ad lib shifting of one group over under another authority until no one will know where anything gets to. I am speaking of efficiency of management—of one of the much-vaunted American virtues—good management. If a little application of it in one department can save us one and one-half billion—and there are nine departments—with a new one suggested—we would have a tidy sum for slum clearance, for decent environment for the children that are going to be America tomorrow.

There are many things in this program I do not like, Mr. Chairman, and I expect to make every effort to improve them—to change them—but I cannot refuse to do something in these areas of our living. I cannot lend myself to nonaction which might well lead to the very Government controls opponents of any housing measure at all fear—by default.

The Committee on Banking and Currency has brought out H. R. 4009 for consideration. But, Mr. Chairman, there is another bill at hand for your consideration which I propose to submit as a substitute bill at the proper time. Much of it is very similar to the committee bill but it contains a balance of interests which should commend it to you.

I have asked for these few minutes in order to urge you to examine it with open minds, as responsible men and women with some understanding of human problems and human needs, free of preconceived ideas and personal prejudices. H. R. 1883 is also before you; it is the result of the effort of a group of like-minded Republicans. Under the rules of the House only one Member's name can appear on a bill, so there are 10 bills, all alike, mine bearing the number H. R. 1883.

Every one of us is as bitterly opposed to centralizing authority as any one of you; every one of us is opposed to Federal authority as against State responsibility. Every one of us has always believed in and emphasized States' rights, individual responsibility. That is our way; that is a part of our formula of freedom.

In H. R. 1883 there is protection for that formula, and there is encouragement for free enterprise and for individual responsibility and self-respect. For myself, I can no longer ignore the needs of the people of my district, which is at present the largest in the United States. Something must be done for the housing needs of the low-income groups whether some parts of it go against my grain or not.

Nor can I blind myself to the fact that there are tremendous changes taking place all over the world. Failure to recognize them is unintelligent. Failure to use all the intelligence and understanding one can muster to give them direction will lead only to destruction—for when a man resists change he destroys himself—that is the law.

Believing deeply in individual and State responsibility, I believe also that because the States united for common protection and mutual well-being there rests upon the Federal Government, which they formed, a certain responsibility toward those States and through them to those individuals unable to carry their part of the load. This responsibility is of several parts, not the least of which is that whatever is done by the Federal Government to help the individual must not encroach upon his responsibilities to himself and to his fellow men.

If I thought this an impossible task, Mr. Chairman, I would not be here.

I cannot set aside my responsibility as a free citizen, as a representative of a large and varied constituency, and as a woman concerned with the future, on the grounds first, that the economy of the United States is in danger, and second, that all Federal assistance, no matter how definitely controlled, is socialistic. If we cannot find ways to make our formula for freedom function, then we are poor exponents of the basic tenets of our American way of life. If we cannot put our financial house in order we are faithless stewards indeed.

Nor do I see justification for permitting those who do want to socialize Government to use the very real needs of certain groups of our people to that end because of our default.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have joined with others and shall at the proper time present a bill which contains a well-rounded housing program, the only program which provides assistance, through loans, not grants or subsidies, to the lower middle-income groups whose needs are very real and very far-reaching in their implications. Our bill broadens the opportunity for free-enterprise building and for responsible men and women to build their own homes, while at the same time it sets up a low-cost housing program to be determined not only by need but also by the capacity of the industry.

I therefore ask every Member of this body to consider H. R. 1883 as a very happy substitute for the committee bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I feel highly honored that I follow the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. She speaks to us as a mother, as an individual who, like us, I feel, appreciates the home.

I trust that we can approach this subject of housing from a bipartisan standpoint. As we study the vote in the Senate, as we study the characteristics of the men who sponsored and worked for the legislation in that body, I feel that we are on sound ground in giving our support to this housing legislation.

The remarks I shall have to make this afternoon will concern the operation of public housing and slum clearance in the State of North Carolina. Photographs convey a more convincing message than will words. To my left here I submit pictures entitled "Before" and "After," concerning an outstanding public housing unit in the city of Raleigh. These pictures marked "Before" carry the message of squalor, disease, juvenile delinquency, broken homes, and these pictures marked "After" portray health, hope, happiness, civic responsibility, and other factors that will make any community a better place in which to live.

As we study public housing, it seems to me that we cannot get away from thinking in terms of children, children in the flexible and impressionable years of their lives.

CHILDREN IN LOW-RENT HOUSING

There is a marked difference between housing authorities as landlords and a lot of other landlords. Instead of "no children" the housing authority says "preference is given to families with children." The policy of giving preference to families with children is an important and sound policy. That the children of today are the citizens of tomorrow is a truism. These are the really flexible individuals. Furthermore, if a more stabilized life for their parents pays dividends for these adults, as we know that it does, it doubly pays dividends in the case of their children. All children are highly sensitive to their surroundings. People begin life as infants unaffected by the attitudes and modes of social behavior of their fellows. We inherit physical modes of behavior, including a nervous system remarkably flexible and capable of being turned in one direction or another. Just as the child who grows up in undesirable home surroundings is handicapped; he is doubly affected where that undesirable home is part of a substandard neighborhood and—contrariwise, the influence of normal home surroundings has an almost inevitable effect. Children respond to brighter home areas, to the adequacies of modern standards of living. Their health—and that of their elders—is improved decidedly by the presence of a modern, private bathroom and by better provisions for fresh air, sunshine, and comfortable heating.

We have heard today that the cost of this program is more than this Government can sustain. Do not be misled, my colleagues. When we consider the cost of crime, juvenile delinquency, the loss of health, the maintenance of mental institutions in our various States, so much of which is due to poor housing, we must come to the immediate conclusion that the cost of this housing program is far less than the cost of juvenile delinquency, crime, loss of health, and other problems that result primarily because of poor housing.

I am happy to have submitted to me by the State health officer of North Carolina, Dr. J. W. R. Norton, a statement which I feel is pertinent to the point I am here presenting. This letter follows:

NORTH CAROLINA STATE
BOARD OF HEALTH,
Raleigh, May 26, 1949.

Hon. C. B. DEANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEANE: It is my understanding that the Senate has again passed a slum clearance bill, which is now before the House for the third time (S. 1070, H. R. 4009).

Adequate housing is, I think, definitely a public health problem. I believe it would be safe to state that if all slum areas were immediately cleaned up, not only would our crude death rate decline at once, but also the death rates from diseases which are traceable wholly or in part to bad sanitation and lack of sunshine and fresh air.

Any argument against slums is like "carrying coals to Newcastle." The purpose of this letter is to express the hope that you will be able to support an adequate slum clearance measure. I should like to get your reaction to the viewpoint I have expressed.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. R. NORTON, M. D.,
Secretary and State Health Officer.

My colleagues, I hope you will continue to study these pictures as I tell you about a tenant who received the benefits of a Raleigh, N. C., housing project. This tenant went in as an individual in the low-income bracket. But within the course of a few years, because of her income, she became ineligible and was requested to move.

This lady has given me permission to quote from a letter she wrote to Mrs. Inez Jones, executive secretary of the housing authority of the city of Raleigh.

She says, among other things:

As you know we will be moving from Halifax Court very soon. I wish there was some way in which to express myself to you and the entire staff of Halifax Court and the administrator of the public-housing program. I think Halifax Court has done for me and my children what the better housing program was intended to do.

With comfortable living quarters which did not require a better part of my income, we have been able to have better food, better clothing, and better health. While there was never a surplus for luxuries, the warmth of steam heat, the nice hot water, the electric stove and the refrigerator, plus the repair of our apartment, has given us a feeling of luxury and well-being. I feel that living at Halifax Court has had a great deal to do with my mental attitude toward life and my responsibility as a mother. This has been greatly reflected in the development of my two children. My son, who graduated from the University of North Carolina in June, and my daughter, who is now in high school.

We are moving into a small attic apartment that will not be nearly as nice as the apartment we had in Halifax Court, and the rent will be much more than we are now paying. However, we leave willingly in order to make room for others who have small children and who may need a boost to their courage as we did 8 years ago when we moved in. I only hope whoever moves into our apartment will find the same joy and happiness that we have known while living there.

G. S. T.

HOME OWNERSHIP

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move on to this particular thought. The greatest amount of opposition I have received so far against this legislation has come from a sincere group of folks representing our local building and loan associations. I think they are greatly misinformed as to the implications of this legislation and they are taking the same position as the insurance companies did toward the social-security legislation that came before the Congress several years ago.

I am interested in and own a small insurance business. I recall when the social-security legislation was being developed here in Washington the insurance fraternity throughout the country violently opposed social security because, as they felt, it would eliminate or greatly jeopardize the insurance market. Well, what has happened? Today among the insurance groups you will find the strongest advocates of social security because social security has opened up a new insurance market. Today, life insurance underwriters sell more life insurance as a result of social security. Briefly, I shall discuss the technical angle and show you just how the agents and underwriters put over the sales angle. They approach a prospect: "How much will your social security mean to you on your retirement?" The answer will usually be $30 or $40 or $50 a month. Then the underwriter will say, "Can you retire on that particular sum?" Immediately the answer is "No." The insurance representative then develops a program of life insurance to bring the person's retirement up to approximately $100 a month and in most cases he makes a sale which brings the prospect's retirement in line with his retirement desires and in 9 out of 10 cases it would not have been possible had social security never become a part of our economy. I use that point, gentlemen of the Committee, to say that through this particu-

lar period that public housing has been in existence, the building and loan groups have greatly prospered.

We have in North Carolina several model housing projects. Time will not permit me to go into a complete analysis of each of them, and what I say about these projects in North Carolina is indeed representative of our entire country.

I repeat, public housing improves family living so that the family moves on to a higher plane of living—to home ownership—to better citizens. How do I know that the families move on to home ownership (and I might say here that no one will deny that it is a definite sign of economic and social progress for a person in the low-income group to own his own home). I know by actual facts shown by a survey made by Dr. Sanford Winston, head of the department of sociology at North Carolina State College, and, too, by recent actual experience in the low-rent housing developments in North Carolina. Dr. Winston's study made in 1946 covered 306 low-income families who had moved from six low-rent projects in my State. Each of these 306 families was visited and interviewed, and of that group 41 percent—125 families—had moved into homes they were buying.

Thus the present occupants of the slums are real potential home owners. I am going to give you here some figures on the ineligible tenants in the low-rent housing projects in North Carolina who had to move because they were making too much money and because of the real support they received while tenants in these local housing projects are now becoming home owners.

Charlotte, N. C.: 80 white ineligible families moved—46 of them bought homes; 17 Negro ineligible families moved—9 of them bought homes.

High Point, N. C.: 55 white ineligible families moved—28 of them bought homes; 2 Negro ineligible families moved—1 of them bought a home.

New Bern, N. C.: 40 white ineligible families moved—11 of them bought homes; 9 Negro ineligible families moved—1 of them bought a home.

Raleigh, N. C.: 61 white ineligible families moved—35 of them bought homes; 9 Negro ineligible families moved—4 of them bought homes.

Wilmington, N. C.: 45 white ineligible families moved—31 of them bought homes; 21 Negro ineligible families moved—15 of them bought homes.

Kinston, N. C.: 44 white ineligible families moved—28 of them bought homes; 11 Negro ineligible families moved—7 of them bought homes.

Totals for State during period May 1947 to May 1949, of ineligible over-income tenants who graduated from the low-rent housing projects and moved into home ownership, 179 white families and 37 Negro families, a total of 216 families, or a total of 54.8 percent of all ineligible tenants who moved, moved into home ownership.

The record will show that private institutions, building and loan associations, and local banks made loans to the greater number of these individuals, and thus they became home owners. They formerly lived in shacks comparable to these "Before" pictures which I ask you to study honestly and sincerely.

Thus a market has been created for our local lending institutions that would never have existed before. These 179 white families and 37 Negro families were lifted out of hovels into a level of housing that created a desire for permanent living standards that are wholesome and which, my friends, will make for better and stronger Americans.

SAVINGS AND LOAN INDUSTRY

The last 15 years have witnessed a remarkable improvement in the development and growth of the savings and loan industry. It is not purely by coincidence that this has come about during a period of extensive Federal participation in the home finance field.

This activity in the housing field was prompted by the collapse of the real estate market and home-building activity during the early thirties. The mortgage foreclosure rate was approaching a thousand a day by mid-1932. This breakdown in home financing was in large part a reflection of the general economic depression; it also reflected inadequacies in the home financing field.

The Federal Government moved on two fronts to cope with the problem. The emergency part of the job was to provide emergency relief to aid hundreds of thousands of distressed home owners and the home financing institutions holding their mortgages. This was done by refinancing these loans through the HOLC on a long-term, single-mortgage basis. The HOLC made over $3,000,000,000 in loans in 3 years to over 1,000,000 home owners. The lending institutions received in lieu of the distressed mortgages the HOLC's Government guaranteed bonds which restored a high degree of liquidity.

The second part of the job was establishing sound long-range methods for aiding private home financing to eliminate the weaknesses and defects that had helped bring on the break-down in the home real estate market. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board was established in 1932 to provide a central credit reservoir to home financing institutions. The act creating the HOLC in 1933 also provided for a Nation-wide system of federally chartered savings and loan institutions which were placed under the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. The following year, 1934, witnessed the establishment of the very important Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, as authorized by the National Housing Act of 1934. This provided insurance of savings in insured savings and loan institutions of up to $5,000 per investor.

The National Housing Act of 1934 also established the Federal Housing Administration which was given the task of insuring mortgage loans made by private financing institutions in such a manner as to help stabilize the home mortgage market, improve home financing practices, and expand home construction.

Other legislation has taken place in the intervening years and the program to aid the savings and loan industry has been refined and improved, reflecting in large part the suggestions of the industry itself.

The record clearly reveals that the savings and loan business has prospered mightily during the past 15 years of Government participation in housing. About 90 percent of the assets of all operating institutions in the savings and loan field are held by members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System. These assets now total over $13,100,000,000, an all-time high, and more than double total assets in 1933 when the Government programs were getting under way.

By the end of 1948, the savings of 6,100,000 investors in more than 2,600 savings and loan associations were insured through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Total savings in such insured associations at that time amounted to $8,300,000,000, a 15-percent increase in 1 year. Because of insurance, these savings have practically the liquidity of bank deposits.

In each of the three full years since the end of World War II, new lending by savings and loan associations has ranged above $3,500,000,000 and now is almost four times as great as in the prewar year of 1939. In the market for home mortgages of $20,000 or less, savings and loan associations have in recent years regularly done about one-third of the total business. This activity has come about primarily through the increase in savings stimulated by insurance and has been aided by the credit facilities of the Home Loan Bank System under which $360,000,000 were advanced last year to member institutions. Over $1,000,000,000 of the loans made by savings and loan institutions have been FHA insured. Moreover, according to estimates by the United States Savings and Loan League, of the nearly $8,000,000,000 total in GI home loans guaranteed by the Federal Government, about one-third were made by savings and loan institutions.

I have recited these facts to bring out one important point—the great increase in growth and activity of the savings and loan industry has been stimulated by the considerable degree of Federal assistance that has been available to it—asssistance that would not have been available from any other source. This assistance has been fully justified, in my judgment, because it has made available a secure outlet for family savings and because it had expanded the credit resources essential for the financing of homes. That those who derive a living from the operation of savings and loan associations or from the use of their credit benefit from these aids is a secondary point.

The fact remain, however, that despite this expansion neither the savings and loan associations nor any other part of the private home building and financing industry has been able to provide decent homes for families who live in slums or other bad housing. Surely if the Government provides any type of Federal assistance in housing, simple justice dictates that this assistance include provision for this considerable portion of American families who are in the direst housing need and whose present housing conditions are a very denial of the American way of life. The provisions of H. R.

4009, which have been recommended by every congressional committee which has studied the problem in the last several years would provide assistance to meet the needs of these families.

I have received a number of communications from executives of savings and loan associations in opposition to this legislation on the grounds that public housing is competitive with their business. This fear has no substantiation in fact. It has been demonstrated time and time again that the present low-rent public-housing program, developed over the same period during which the savings and loan industry has had its great growth, has served only those families whom private enterprise could not serve. H. R. 4009 contains additional safeguards to assure that public housing will in no sense be competitive with decent private housing. Representatives of the savings and loan industry who appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency as much as admitted that fact. For example, Gen. Ralph M. Smith, chairman of the legislative committee of the United States Savings and Loan League, said—I quote from page 410 of the committee's hearings:

> I think if public housing goes through we can still continue to operate, so that I am not fearful that this is going to drive us out of business.

Mr. Chairman, I think the poor people of this country—the people who would be rejected as poor risks by these same lending institution executives—have rights before the Congress in their quest for decent homes which are equal to the rights of those people for whom credit aids have been provided in such great abundance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I again wish to repeat my statement made earlier. I have a great admiration for our savings and loan groups. Today I pay tribute to them because in the early days of my own married life it was my opportunity to secure sufficient strength from a local building and loan association that made it possible for us to own our home. But, my friends, in opposing this legislation some of these savings and loan groups have not taken the time to add up the great benefits that have accrued to them because of public housing.

Mr. Chairman, briefly let me make the following observations under the headings: Better housing for people is a wise investment; loans are not costs; cost of Federal contribution; and only eligible low-income families are admitted to low-rent housing.

COSTS OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Let us look at the provision for maximum subsidy of $400,000,000 per year in H. R. 4009 and remember that this is maximum. Using actual experience of local housing authorities which have been in operation under the Housing Act of 1937, a reasonable estimate would bring the maximum costs down to $310,000,000 per year, or to $9,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 over the period during which the annual contributions would actually be paid instead of the maximum of $16,000,000,000. How is that figured?

Actual experiences on the present public housing program shows total annual contributions have amounted to 58.5 percent of the maximum which could have been paid. Since these recent years have been years of somewhat higher incomes than normally would be true, instead of using 58.5 percent as an estimate of the percentage required, assume that somewhere between 75 to 80 percent of the maximum would be needed; then estimate that not 40 years will be needed to pay out the projects but that all bonds will be retired over a period of about 30 years.

There is possibility, too, in further reduction of the over-all estimated cost figure of $9,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 if the interest rate on the permanent bonds sold to private investors should be lower than the rate of 2 percent on which the above calculation of over-all costs has been made.

LOANS ARE NOT COSTS

Now let's talk about costs. The maximum of $700,000,000 in loans under H. R. 4009 for low-rent housing is not a cost since the loans would be repayable by the local housing authorities with interest. The Federal lending assistance for the projects would primarily be temporary interim financing until the projects have been constructed and permanently financed by sale of bonds to private investors. The security dealers in America have realized the attractiveness of housing-authority bonds and have endorsed public housing all along—they say they are interested in the purchase of bonds to finance the capital cost of low-rent housing under H. R. 4009.

A practical example of financing low-rent housing is the story in Raleigh, N. C. The Federal Government does not have any money on loan to the housing authority there—all of the Raleigh Authority's bonds—$1,704,000 now outstanding—are held by private investors. They were purchased in 1946—$1,832,000 at that time, by an investment syndicate at a net interest cost of 1.28 percent. The longest maturity is 30 years—with the final bond maturing in 1976. Then what happens when the last bond issued by the Raleigh Authority is paid and matured? Federal cash contributions will cease in 1976 when all bonds have been retired, the housing developments will be debt-free and will continue to be a community asset operated by the local housing authority for the benefit of the people and the community. It should be borne in mind that the projects will forever be limited to low-income families as provided under the State law creating housing authorities.

BETTER HOUSING FOR PEOPLE IS A WISE INVESTMENT

When an individual spends money he wants to know that it is wisely spent—that is a good investment. A sound business corporation wants to know that its money is spent wisely. Improvements which are contemplated are considered carefully. The business corporation wants to be sure that money spent for improvements will produce greater efficiency and greater profits. I believe, too, that the Congress wants to be sure that expenditures which it authorizes are, first, necessary expenditures and, secondly, will prove to be sound and economical—a wise investment of the people's money that will produce a high return on the investment.

Now for just a moment I should like to talk about what it cost the Federal Government in 1949 for a family of four—man, wife, and two children—in my State of North Carolina to live in a low-rent housing deevlopment. It cost the Government $59.16 for 1 year—per month, $4.93. Then let's see what total costs might be for this family. A survey made of a group of low-income families in North Carolina who had lived in the projects and moved out showed an average stay of 4½ years in the housing developments. If this is an average then it would cost $266.22 for this family to live there 4½ years.

And even if the average I have used should not prevail and the contribution per family required from the Government would reach the maximum of $156.36 per family per year and if the family stayed longer than the 4½-year average—say it stayed 6 years before it "graduated" and moved on, the total investment in this family would be $938.

The question then seems to be: What is the return on this investment that the Government makes in better housing for low-income families?

The answer to that question is a very simple one: Public housing improves family living so that the family then moves on to a higher plane of living—to home ownership, to better citizens—so that they are an asset to the community and Nation instead of a liability and cost.

Let me remind you that adequate housing directly affects not one but two generations so that the return on the investment for better housing is automatically doubled. There is the improved family life of the parents and the adequate healthful environment so important for the children if they are to grow up as socially adequate members of society. I know this is true—mayors, health officials, parents, teachers, social workers, juvenile court and police officials, and many others have testified to the beneficent influence of the more adequate environment and to the social worth whileness of the public-housing projects.

ONLY ELIGIBLE LOW-INCOME FAMILIES ARE ADMITTED TO LOW-RENT HOUSING

We know, of course, that both the Federal law and the existing State laws have established eligibility requirements for admission to public housing; that the two basic statutory requirements are: Families must be living in substandard housing, that is, under substandard conditions that are detrimental to health, safety, and morals; and families must have incomes within the income limits for admission established by the housing authority to limit tenancy to low-income tenants.

I looked at the file of a tenant in one of the low-rent housing projects. I saw immediately by the verified data in the

file that the family was a low-income family because the total family income was $32.50 per week—$1,673 annually after deducting social security of 1 percent. The income had been verified by the employer who telephoned the housing authority office asking help for his employee and saying that he was in serious need of better housing. I might say here that I can well understand why employers seek better housing for their employees, as they often do—the employer knows that home conditions have a direct effect on the production which the employer gets from his employee.

This particular tenant was a veteran—young, age 28. He has a wife and two daughters, age 8 and 3, a son age 5. Where was he living when he was accepted for occupancy at the public-housing project? Well, I've already told you that his income was $32.50 per week and this is a family of five persons. I don't believe it takes much figuring to see that you can't pay high rent out of $32.50 per week and have enough left to feed and clothe five persons. This is the kind of housing that this particular veteran had for his wife and three children; as inspected by a representative of the housing authority office who made a visit to the living quarters to determine housing need.

This family of five had one room and space in a small hall, in a house in a bad general condition needing major repairs.

This family of five was living, eating, and sleeping in the one room except that the little boy had a cot in the hall next to the toilet and sink.

Their kitchen? A sink in the hall, used also for bathing by this family of five and another family of five. The stove? Why, it was in their only room, which, do not forget, was used also for living and sleeping.

What about their toilet facilities and bath? A piece of beaverboard had been used to partition off the toilet in the hall—that also served as a partition between the toilet and the sink right next to it.

No; they did not have a private bath—they used that sink for their baths but remember, too, that they were sharing that sink with five other persons, so it would appear pretty certain that this couldn't be considered satisfactory bathing facilities.

HOUSING A BENEFIT, NOT A BURDEN

The thought of economy and taxes certainly comes into the equation. On that point let me advise with you concerning a public housing project in the city of Wilmington, N. C. What I can say of Wilmington is characteristic of the entire country.

As you study the history of slums you will generally find that they are a tax liability. In most cases the local tax authorities view slums as offering the poorest source of revenue because slums just do not pay their way and are therefore an economic liability.

I inserted in the RECORD of June 13 an editorial which appeared in a daily newspaper of the city of Wilmington. Among other things, the editorial points this out:

But the big question is, Has the authority paid its way?

We are convinced—by facts—that the answer is an emphatic yes.

Before the two projects were built, the taxes on their tracts amounted to only $1,500 a year. And when the authority took over the sites unpaid back taxes amounted to approximately $8,500, which it paid.

In addition, until the voluntary payments in lieu of taxes were halted by national legislation, the authority had paid the city and county governments $35,250.34.

In other words, the local governments have received $43,750 because these two slum-clearance projects were erected whereas had they not been built the amount coming in from taxes on the property they now occupy would have been but $10,500, had the taxes been paid.

HOUSING A JOINT UNDERTAKING

Mr. Chairman, ever since this bill has been under consideration I have heard a lot of talk about it being a "big city" bill, with a small farm housing program thrown in as a sop to get the votes of Members of Congress from rural areas. This is not a correct assumption. We have learned during the years of our national existence that this Nation is interdependent, that what is good for the people of one part of our country is good for the country as a whole.

On that basis I strongly favor H. R. 4009.

Our forefathers learned that fact when they wrote and adopted the Constitution 160 years ago. They found that we needed a Federal Government strong enough to do the things which the people of the States could not do for themselves. They found that out decades before the railroads and the development of the machine age inextricably bound the economy of our Nation together, over a century before the development of modern highway transportation for the movement of goods and people, and a century and a half before it became possible for me to come from North Carolina to Washington by air line in a matter of minutes.

As we have become a great industrial Nation, with a majority of our people living in cities and towns, we have learned through good times and bad times that no section of our country can prosper unless the country as a whole is prospering. The rural areas of North Carolina or any other section cannot prosper unless the people in the cities throughout the Nation can buy the products of our farms and mills and factories. The cities cannot prosper unless the rural people in North Carolina and other States can do business with them.

I should like to call attention here to the extent to which my colleagues who represent primarily urban districts have recognized this interdependence in their support of national legislation which benefits most directly rural areas. It could, in fact, have been immediately more beneficial to their constituents for them to have opposed some farm measures, but they recognized that failure to pass these measures would have caused great distress in agricultural areas which would have dragged down the economy in urban areas. I appreciate their actions not because of their generosity but because of their long-range consideration of what would do the country, urban and rural, the most good.

Now what has that to do with this housing legislation? Well, in the first place, home building has an important role in our national economy and if we can do something that will sustain this industry at a high level of production, as H. R. 4009 will help to do, then I think that it is to the interest of our constituents to vote for it. But more importantly, the kind of homes people are brought up in determines, to a very great extent, the capacity of the people to become useful citizens—to maintain and improve standards of living—which will affect all of us both economically and socially. If, as has been proved time and time again, the slums of the cities destroy incentives and faith in American institutions through their depredations on health and morals, then the whole Nation needs to be concerned. When the mayors and other city officials demonstrate, as they have done, that they cannot handle these problems alone because of their limited capacity to tap the taxable wealth of the Nation, then it is in the interest of the entire nation, urban and rural, for the Federal Government to assist the cities in eliminating these conditions.

Even if this were strictly a big city bill, therefore, I would still hope that it would get support from rural areas because of the national interest.

But the real fact is that this is not a big city bill, but is rather a housing bill for the entire Nation. I am not only saying this because it has a farm-housing title, although I think that this particular title is important because it would make a real start on the elimination of bad housing conditions on the farms. I am saying this also because of the research title, which will help reduce the cost of new housing wherever it is located. I am saying this also because we are going to use the slum clearance and the low-rent public housing provisions down our way.

We do not have any big cities in North Carolina. But we have a large number of small cities and towns—places where everybody knows almost everybody else. We have slums and bad housing in these towns, too. I know about them. I have seen them, and I am happy to say that many of these small towns and cities are doing something to improve housing.

Now we are going to use the slum clearance and public housing provisions of H. R. 4009 in North Carolina because we already know something about what good housing does to low-income families—we can measure it in the physical and spiritual uplift of these families as I pointed out in reading from a letter written by a lady who had received the benefits of a Raleigh housing project.

WHO WILL WORK FOR THE LOW-INCOME GROUP?

Mr. Chairman, the little people do not have a well-paid lobby in Washington because they cannot afford it, even when they reach the magnificent salary of $2,600 per year. I am going to pay heed to the 2,313 families in Raleigh alone who are on the waiting list for admission to low-rent housing and the low-income families who are waiting for good housing in the other cities of North Carolina and every other State in the Union. Their

needs today are just as great as that of the widow I mentioned a while ago.

APPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

What this public housing program has meant in North Carolina is indicated by the applications which were submitted for Federal assistance 5 years ago, in connection with the President's request to Federal agencies for a postwar shelf of projects. Remember that these applications were for 3-year programs and were submitted before any legislation for additional low-rent public housing was pending and before the housing shortage had developed to its present acute stage. Nevertheless 16 North Carolina communities proposed 3-year programs aggregating 6,700 dwellings. I am advised that they plan considerably larger programs on a 7-year basis today if this legislation is passed. Even by North Carolina standards, I do not believe anyone could say that this is a big-city program. Here is the list of communities whose applications range from 70 to 1,800 units: Asheville, 500 units; Beaufort, 70 units; Charlotte, 1,800 units; Clinton, 75 units; Concord, 200 units; Dunn, 85 units; Fayetteville, 550 units; Greensboro, 600 units; High Point, 450 units; Kinston, 250 units; Lexington, 200 units; Morehead, 110 units; New Bern, 300 units; Raleigh, 600 units; Smithfield, 90 units; and Winston-Salem, 850 units.

Time will not permit a complete analysis of the interest in public housing, but I mention briefly applications from a few Southern States.

Arkansas, 2,577 units from 8 communities, with range from 150 to 800 units: Arkadelphia, 200 units; Blytheville, 250 units; Conway, 100 units; Fort Smith, 800 units; Little Rock, 600 units; North Little Rock, 227 units; Pulaski County, 150 units; and Russellville, 250 units.

Alabama, 9,800 units from 14 communities, with range from 122 to 3,000 units: Attalla, 122 units; Bessemer, 726 units; Birmingham, 3,000 units; Decatur, 389 units; Dothan, 148 units; Gadsden, 1,000 units; Homewood, 300 units; Huntsville, 372 units; Jasper, 160 units; Mobile, 1,000 units; Montgomery, 1,526 units; Phenix City, 630 units; Selma, 255 units; and Tarrant, 172 units.

Florida, 10,532 units from 14 communities, with range from 90 to 3,500 units: Clearwater, 150 units; Fort Myers, 208 units; Jacksonville, 1,700 units; Jacksonville Beach, 90 units; Key West, 260 units; Lakeland, 220 units; Miami, 3,500 units; Orlando, 464 units; Pensacola, 500 units; St. Petersburg, 900 units; Sanford, 150 units; Sarasota, 120 units; Tampa, 2,020 units; and West Palm Beach, 250 units.

Georgia, 9,340 units from 15 communities, with range from 34 to 2,500 units: Albany, 190 units; Americus, 400 units; Athens, 226 units; Atlanta, 2,500 units; Augusta, 750 units; Brunswick, 450 units; Columbus, 1,400 units; Dawson, 150 units; Griffin, 300 units; Macon, 600 units; Marietta, 250 units; Savannah, 1,680 units; Thomasville, 34 units; Valdosta, 210 units; and Waycross, 200 units.

Kentucky, 1,525 units from 8 communities, with range from 31 to 375 units: Danville, 100 units; Frankfort, 32 units; Georgetown, 90 units; Lexington, 300 units; Owensboro, 350 units; Paducah, 375 units; Paris, 128 units; and Richmond, 150 units.

Texas, 17,166 units from 21 communities, with range from 50 to 3,300 units: Amarillo, 800 units; Austin, 500 units; Bay City, 150 units; Beaumont, 1,100 units; Borger, 250 units; Brownsville, 200 units; Brownwood, 300 units; Corpus Christi, 1,000 units; Dallas, 2,800 units; Eagle Pass, 50 units; El Paso, 660 units; Fort Worth, 926 units; Galveston, 1,400 units; Houston, 3,300 units; Lubbock, 350 units; McAllen, 300 units; Mercedes, 200 units; San Antonio, 2,000 units; San Beristo, 200 units; Texas City, 180 units; and Wichita Falls, 500 units.

WHO RUNS OUR PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITIES?

I became interested in finding out who were operating these low-rent public housing projects in my home State, the kind of individuals who were responsible for these additional requests. Mr. Speaker, as a result of this brief research, I can say with all frankness that anyone who brands this program as socialistic or communistic is libeling the good citizens of our communities—the merchants, bankers, doctors, lawyers, labor representatives, and, yes, even real-estate men—who are serving on these local housing authority boards and who are prepared to undertake the programs which would be authorized under H. R. 4009.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the list of commissioners of a few of these local authorities.

CHARLOTTE

Edwin L. Jones, chairman (since 1938): President of J. A. Jones Construction Co. (one of the largest construction companies in America, and construction engineer for Atomic Energy Commission); trustee of Duke University; prominent Methodist layman; owner of large diversified interests and active in all civic interests.

George W. Dowdy: Vice president and general manager, Belk's department stores; coowner of radio broadcasting chain including WAYS in Charlotte; director of local bank; past president, Merchants Association; active in Boy Scout work and other civic interests.

Earle W. Gluck: President of radio station WSOC (NBC); captain, United States Naval Reserve; senior naval officer in district; past president, Charlotte Kiwanis club; outstanding leader in community.

Ben O. Dickerson: District representative, Hershey Chocolate Co.; veteran, World War II; chairman, American Legion housing committee for North Carolina.

Zeb C. Strawn: Vice president, Citizens Savings Bank; active civic, community affairs and also has a keen interest in matters affecting farmers.

FAYETTEVILLE

Thompson T. Bells, chairman: Divisional engineer for the North Carolina Highway and Public Works Commission; retired lieutenant colonel, United States Army (Regular); Rotarian; graduate of Princeton Unicersity.

H. M. Pinkston, vice chairman: Retired building and supply distributor; past governor of Kiwanis Club.

Dr. W. T. Rainey: Superintendent of Highsmith Hospital; distinguished diagnostician who has received recognition many times from the American Medical Association.

Joseph T. Maloney: Owner of M & O Chevrolet Co., four times president of Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce; chairman of Community Chest; past district governor of Rotary Club; prominent Catholic layman.

J. W. Hinsdale: Managing director and member of Belk-Hinsdale, large department store; active in Boy Scout work; member of the board of trustees, city schools; director of Red Cross; many other religious and civic activities.

KINSTON

Jack R. Rountree, chairman (since 1939): Episcopal minister; a trustee of Memorial General Hospital; trustee of Kinston Public Library.

Harry Wooten, Sr., (vice chairman since 1939): Retired; director of Branch Banking & Trust Co.

J. C. Hood: Owner of drug store; president, Mutual Building and Loan Association.

J. S. May: Retired; former city councilman and former county commissioner.

W. C. Boone, Sr.: Tobacconist and farmer.

WILMINGTON

Harry M. Solomon, chairman: Director of Peoples Building Association; owner, wholesale drygoods company; director, Kiwanis Club; director, American Red Cross chapter; director, Boys Brigade Club; trustee, local Salvation Army chapter; president of Community Chest Campaign; trustee of Jewish Synagogue; director of Community Council; large real-estate owner; director of two local banking institutions.

C. B. Kornegay: Retired Atlantic Coast Line employee; president of Wilmington Central Labor Unions; member of national advisory board of A. F. of L.; member, Atlantic Coast Line retirement board; member of advisory council of Railway Brotherhoods; board of director of Community Chest; large land owner.

Fred E. Little: Operator of chain of laundries in North Carolina; owner of Wilmington Stamp & Printing Co.; director, Kiwanis Club; campaign president of Boys Brigade Club; director, Cooperative Building & Loan Association; director of American Red Cross local chapter; large landowner.

Rev. Mortimer Glover: Rector of St. James Episcopal Church; trustee and board of directors for 14 different colleges and seminaries; president of Community Council; board of directors of community past presidents of American Red Cross; director of New Hanover County Board of Associated Charities; past president of Community Chest; past president, Wilmington Minorities Association; welfare division, Community Council.

Dr. Charles J. Powell: Fellow member, James Walker Memorial Hospital Board of Surgeons, and member of New Hanover Medical Society; director, Girl Scouts; board of directors, local Cancer Society; member of Council of Juvenile Delinquency Committee.

NEW BERN

W. Floyd Gaskins, chairman (since 1946): Owner and manager of drugs, supplies business; large real-estate owner; director of New Bern Building & Loan Association; civic leader.

Harry Lipman, vice chairman: Coowner and executive director of local large department store; trustee of Elks Building; community leader; member, American Legion.

M. Bynum Smith: Secretary and coowner of Coplon-Smith Co., Inc., one of New Bern's largest department stores.

Louis B. Daniel: Manager and director of New Bern Coca-Cola Bottling Works.

Dr. Charles H. Ashford: Leading physician and surgeon; member, American College of Surgeons; director of New Bern Morris Plan Bank.

RALEIGH

B. F. Brown, chairman (first appointed 1938): Dean emeritus of the basic division of North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering.

Theodore S. Johnson, vice chairman: Professor of civil engineering and adviser of the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering; originally appointed in 1938.

R. K. Creighton: Secretary of Kirchofer & Arnold, Inc., securities for investment.

Samuel W. Ruark: Lawyer.

R. Mayne Albright: Lawyer.

HIGH POINT

D. A. Dowdy, chairman (since 1939): Principal owner and president of large chain of drug stores; active in local civic work.

Dr. F. C. Grayson, vice chairman: Prominent physician and surgeon.

Charles F. Carroll: Superintendent of schools; prominent in educational work in the State.

B. H. Hackney, Jr.: Local Boy Scout executive officer for area, including High Point and neighboring cities.

S. D. Clapp: Representative for large flour and feed distributors; active in religious and civic work.

RURAL HOUSING

Mr. Chairman, coming as I do, from the southern section of this country, I want to voice my appreciation of the support given this legislation by both Democrats and Republicans from the metropolitan areas of our country. I think it is a sad commentary upon our great body here that when we begin to bring up matters of wide national interest, sectional factions make themselves heard and felt. I am a Democrat, but I hope the time will come that when measures of such widespread national interest as housing, we can approach the subject on a nonpartisan basis.

And again I wish to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and these other distinguished Members on my left for the effort they are making in behalf of housing legislation.

Speaking of title IV, which concerns rural housing, I wish to pay my respects to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], who has in a large measure fathered this title and to thank him for his efforts in behalf of H. R. 4009.

I repeat, it is a sad commentary upon us people who live in urban areas that today we have allowed our rural people to subject themselves to such shameful housing conditions. We must act, and now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina three additional minutes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I say it is a sad commentary on us urban people for allowing our rural housing to get into the condition that now exists. Neither do I blame the commercial banks for refusing to go in and lend money in these particular areas, because they do not feel that they are financially secure. But, do you know, Mr. Chairman, that not over 20 percent of the rural housing in America has running water and toilet facilities? Then we wonder why the young people are leaving the farm for the city. Surely we cannot expect an intelligent young man or young woman to maintain his residence even in the old homestead when it is not provided with some of the most elementary necessities that go to make the home what it should be.

Mr. Chairman, I trust we will, as we come to the final vote on this bill, aid our communities in ridding themselves of these backward conditions in housing. I am satisfied that it is Christian to make it possible for our people, whether they live in the metropolitan areas of the country or in some rural community, to enjoy the benefits of better housing.

I commend our committee chairman the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] for the efficient and fair manner in which he has conducted our hearings over weeks and weeks, and in having brought out this splendid bill. When we vote for it we vote for a great measure.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we all are familiar with the real-estate lobby composed primarily of the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the United States Savings and Loan League, but there is another group out to defeat this bill which uses even more effective methods and slogans.

As President Truman stated in his letter to Speaker RAYBURN concerning the Housing Act, the most loudly proclaimed propaganda argument of the various lobbying groups against the act is the claim that it is socialistic. There is one group in particular which bases its attacks on this housing bill as well as any progressive legislation designed to assist the less fortunate segment of our population on the argument that our Government is becoming socialistic. This organization has a long and varied lists of names which it uses for fund-collection purposes—its most familiar title is "The Commitee for Constitutional Government." Its newest title which appeared in the Wall Street Journal in two pages of advertisements on Monday, June 20, is "Fighters for Freedom."

WHAT GROUP OPPOSES

To the Members who have been bombarded with literature by this group on all-important legislation which has come before us this session, I think that a short history of the Committee for Constitutional Government will be very enlightening.

Here are some of the measures, groups, and issues, which the Committee for Constitutional Government has opposed in the last 4 years: Federal-income taxes, European recovery program, United Nations Organization, universal military training, the International Trade Organization, labor unions, Federal aid to education, and housing; admission of displaced persons. Various persons on the board of directors for the Committee for Constitutional Government have also been influential in such organizations as America's Future, Inc.; National Economic Council, American Action Committee, American Democratic National Committee (organized to defeat Roosevelt), and now Fighters for Freedom.

This is what the Congressional Quarterly Notebook of March 10, 1948, said about the way in which the Committee for Constitutional Government worked:

WORK FOR MONEY—NOT VOTES

Homer Dodge, the committee's Washington lobbyist, told Congressional Quarterly that "instead of playing for votes in the lower brackets, it would be better to get pools of capital from the higher brackets."

This is a very frank admission of the nature of the group which the Committee for Constitutional Government is organized to serve. Their objection to a bill which helps those in the lowest income bracket becomes more understandable in the light of their own statement.

To quote again from the quarterly:

MAILING LISTS

Most of the committee's work is done through selected mailing lists which total several hundred thousand names. In 1947, the committee distributed 80,000,000 pieces of literature, much of it advocating tax reduction. The same activity has continued in 1948.

For at least part of its distribution, the committee relies on Members of Congress. The testimony of Dr. Willford I. King, committee chairman, before the House Ways and Means Committee was widely distributed under the frank of Ways and Means Chairman Harold Knutson, Republican, of Minnesota. Statements of the Committee for Constitutional Government are also occasionally inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by sympathetic Members of Congress and distributed in the same way.

In this type of distribution, Dodge explained, the committee pays for the printing costs, but its name does not appear on the material and "the person receiving it doesn't know we instigated it."

Besides its own mailing lists and the distribution obtained through congressional franks, the committee counts heavily on a chain reaction among persons on the receiving end. Almost all its literature carries appeals to recipients to order extra copies to be sent to friends, business associates, and Members of Congress. The extent of this chain reaction, Dodge said, is amazing. It means, of course, that there is a frequent duplication, especially among Members of Congress.

TRIED TO MAKE RICH RICHER AND POOR POORER

This intensive method of spreading propaganda has been used for 5 years to promote a constitutional amendment which would forbid the Federal Government to levy a tax of more than 25 percent on any income, no matter how large, and would also ban any Federal estate or inheritance tax. This attack has been designed to make it impossible for the Government to furnish war veterans, farmers, the old, and the people in the lowest financial brackets any benefits which they now have, and to prevent any further benefits such as a chance for adequate housing. The Committee for Constitutional Government commenced a sneak campaign several years ago to get the State legislatures to adopt a resolution asking for a constitutional convention to consider the amendment of the sixteenth amendment which would prevent Congress from having the power to levy taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts in excess of 25 percent. This proposal would increase the wealth of the rich and afford no tax reduction to the people in the lower-income tax brackets. Seventeen States had adopted the resolution before the nature of the movement was disclosed—six States then passed rescinding resolutions. The movement

flared up again in the Nebraska Legislature last month; so I assume the Committee on Constitutional Government has not given up its plan to further the interests of its wealthy backers. According to Treasury Department's experts, under the proposed plan, the 49,000,000 low-income taxpayers who now pay 54.15 percent of the present individual income levy would have to assume liability for 65.8 percent of that levy under the plan. The scheme was characterized by some as the millionaires' amendment—and I think that is a very good description of its purposes.

The Committee on Constitutional Government is designed to protect the power of a select group of our citizens who have accumulated enough money to qualify them for leadership in the eyes of this biggest and most dangerous lobby in America. The attitude of the committee and other real-estate lobby groups is exemplified by the following remark which a real-estate promoter made to a young veteran and his wife who were looking at the prospectus for some cooperatives apartments soon to be completed in this city: "We have set the down payment at 40 percent to attract a high caliber and more desirable type of tenant."

MILLIONS SPENT FOR LOBBYING

It is a matter of congressional record that the group behind this innocent sounding patriotic name, spent $100,000,000 over a 7-year period for 82,000,000 pieces of literature, recordings, and so forth.

CLEVER SCHEME

A clever method has been devised by the committee to make it profitable or at least costless for corporations to make contributions. Under this scheme corporations run no risk of contributing to a political group and are able to deduct costs as advertising expenses on their income-tax returns. The plan is simple—the Committee on Constitutional Government sells the corporation books which cost but a few cents to publish but for which the corporation pays a substantial amount. The great profits are used to finance the propaganda activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government. The book which is currently being sold according to the ad in Monday's June 20, 1949, Wall Street Journal is Norton's book, The Constitution of the United States, at 60 cents a copy. Here are the number of books the committee hopes to sell according to their statement in the Wall Street Journal:

I quote:

Purchases by corporations or individuals, in order to meet this demand, are needed as follows:

A. 8 buying 4,000 books, $2,400 each	$19,200
B. 15 buying 1,000 books, $600 each	9,000
C. 35 buying 500 books, $300 each	10,500
D. 60 buying 250 books, $150 each	9,000
E. 90 buying 100 books, $60 each	5,400
F. 230 buying 50 books, $30 each	6,900

This scheme was hit upon after the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, in 1945, as chairman of the House Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures in the year 1944, protested to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that contributors to the Committee on Constitutional Government were receiving tax exemptions although the activities of the group were without a doubt political in nature. The new book idea was announced in a letter which went to executives all over the United States in the fall of 1947. Here is a statement from that letter:

UNCLE SAM PAYS THE BILL

If you have not yet used up your 15-percent tax deductible allowance, or if your company has not yet used its 5 percent of net allowance for educational and philanthropic work, make a contribution to colleges to distribute this book. For this special purpose, make your check payable to Sumner Gerard, agent. (In addition corporations and individuals can charge such purchase to business expense and get a tax deduction.)

I do not doubt that some books are distributed under the scheme, but the cost of those books to the Committee on Constitutional Government is but a small amount of the money received from contributors—and the majority of the money is used to protect the special interests of a few wealthy individuals and corporations against the general interest of the people.

I have selected some statements from the many pieces of literature which the Committee on Constitutional Government has sent to me to illustrate the attitude of the committee toward any housing bill which assists these in the lower-income brackets:

FALSE PROPAGANDA

First the Committee on Constitutional Government blamed rent control for the housing shortage. It compared the situation in the United States to that which prevails in France, which has had rent controls, but which has also had two major wars fought on its soil. The committee said abolishing rent controls in the United States would stimulate building by property owners, but there was no explanation in any of the material as to how the people in the lowest-income bracket were going to obtain housing. The special-interest groups represented by the Committee on Constitutional Government are going to build for profit—not for the welfare of the people living in substandards housing who cannot hope to pay the high rents and down payments charged by the builders who are concerned only with filling their own pockets.

The committee states:

Houses cost too much for three principal reasons; they are: rent controls, antiquated building codes, "featherbedding" union rules. Building workers, by maintaining strong unions, keep wage rates far above the levels which would exist if competition prevailed.

AGAINST LABOR

What is the remedy suggested by the Committee for Constitutional Government? Abolish the right of the working man to strike to protect his wage rates. Here is the statement of Dr. Willford I. King, chairman of the committee:

The working man does not need to strike to protect himself, for he always can follow Bruce Bairnsfather's famous precept—"If there's a better 'ole, go to it."

It is almost unbelievable that anyone could suggest that laborers be left completely unprotected against the highly organized building industry.

Let's carry the suggestion of the committee a little further—if wage rates for laborers in the housing industry were reduced substantially, would this cause real-estate owners and builders to begin buying up slum housing and constructing low-cost housing for the people who need housing most? Or would it merely cause the builders to reap greater profits on the type housing which they favor—housing for the upper middle and high-income bracket families?

PAUL REVERE MESSAGES

Typical of the material put out by the Committee for Constitutional Government are throw sheets called Paul Revere messages. The Members will be interested in the description of the protagonists in the housing fight as described by the committee in one of the Paul Revere messages: the people who need low-cost housing are described in these words, "long haired, often fanatical, frustrated Socialist or Communist delegations"; the members of the real-estate lobby are painted in slightly different terms, "These frugal, self-governing, hard-working, respectful property owners."

POOR CANNOT CONTACT CONGRESSMEN

It is sad but true that the people who need the housing have had few spokesmen. They cannot afford long-distance calls to your offices; they cannot publish full-page ads in the Wall Street Journal; they cannot distribute elaborate printed booklets.

The great agitation against this bill by the real-estate lobby is most difficult to understand since the housing provided under the bill will be designed only for those groups whom the real-estate lobby does not choose to assist.

Nor is it easy to understand their arguments that the Federal Government is going to compete with private industry. Certainly the actual examples of disposition of public housing by the Government after the war should allay their fears—for in almost every case private real-estate operators were able to buy Government-constructed property at a small fraction of its cost and value.

A TYPICAL GROUP

I have described in detail the activities of the Committe on Constitutional Government because it is typical of the groups in this country which advocate rule by the privileged interests—a maintenance of status quo—no legislation of social value. I have deliberately avoided mention of the fact that this particular group has at times verged on an almost Fascist approach to government. Some of the members of the Committee on Constitutional Government have been associated with other groups which are most reactionary and publicly known to be Fascist. But there have been enough accusations in the air lately, and I believe I have described their activities in sufficient detail to show beyond question the special-interest group which is represented. These bigots who resent the idea of housing programs for the poor should remember the origins of our country and the fact that it was founded by poor people who fled from the tyranny of religious persecution.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, no one in this Chamber has a greater call from duty to speak than have I. My home is Chicago, and I would stand debased in the eyes of the men and women who elected me if I did not do all to the utmost of my ability in support of H. R. 4009.

For days, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I sat and listened to many witnesses. Spokesmen for our veterans appeared Among them was no disunity. The men and women we were cheering in the war years were united in their demand for the enactment of this proposed legislation. Spokesmen for labor, for the women voters of the Nation, for practically every segment of our population, except the real-estate lobby and its allies, appeared before our committee, all in favor of this measure.

The spokesmen for the real-estate lobby assured us that there was no housing shortage, that in the last 3 years private industry had supplied 10,000,000 people with homes, that the veterans and their families were happy because they had good homes and there were plenty more available at a low rental or sale price. They assured us, indeed, that private enterprise, in 36 years, would rehouse the entire population of the United States. The lobby's representative readily met the demand for proof by producing six photographs of houses in the remotest sections of America.

Being from the second city of America, naturally I desired a showing from my city. The gentleman accommodatingly dug deep into his collection of portfolios and came up smilingly with a picture of a house in Hobart, Ind. He put several hundred words into the record, to be printed at the expense of the Government, in an attempt to prove either my blindness or stupidity in questioning his statement that Hobart, Ind., was not really part of Chicago and within 15 minutes of the city hall. Any constituent of mine—living in Joe Plunkett's ward, beginning at Thirty-ninth Street—could not turn the trick in 15 minutes. I, in Jim Ryan's ward, living in the seventy-sixth block, could not get to the city hall in twice the time. And Hobart, Ind., is miles and miles away from the last bit of soil of Illinois in the district of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCKLEY], which takes up where mine leaves off around Ninety-fifth Street.

If I should go back to Chicago and tell my constituents that I place greater weight on what this real-estate lobby tells me than what they see with their own eyes, and I see with my own eyes, they would have the good common sense to wonder what had influenced me.

I am not selling out the people of Chicago to the real-estate lobby.

I am not going back to Chicago and tell my veteran friends that there is no housing shortage since thousands of them are living in the only available quarters, cramped up, doubled up, many without the ordinary facilities, many of these homes scarcely fit for human habitation—the best homes that the free enterprise of the real-estate lobby has seen fit or profitable to furnish to the heroes we were praying for in the war years.

I have seen enough of the real-estate lobby in my less than 6 months in the Eighty-first Congress. Every time the postman has come to my office, he has left its handiwork. Do the high-salaried directors of the publicity drive of the real-estate lobby think that all of the Members of this Congress are stupid? Some of these gentlemen, it is generally known, receive salaries of $100,000 per year and upward, but their work is so very crude that if I were the director of the real-estate lobby, I would fire the entire gang and go out and hire a few hard-working, honest-to-goodness newspapermen.

In every letter I have received emanating from this source, and against H. R. 4009, has been the same phraseology, only slightly rearranged. There has been the same avoidance of the facts that I found when the spokesmen of the real-estate lobby attempted to answer my questions in the hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee. The only illuminating light that I could get from the gentlemen was that there was no money in the home-building business until 1938 and that the year he went into business was 1938.

I have no objection to a man going into a business in which he can make money. But I do not think that the real-estate lobby would have had enough money to kill housing legislation before the Eightieth Congress and to make the terrific drive that I have seen going on in the Eighty-first Congress if there had been less victimizing of veterans and others who were forced to pay exorbitant prices for homes because of a housing shortage which the real-estate lobby, for its own selfish interest, was seeking to continue.

I do not believe that money could buy such a man as the venerable, beloved and godly Msgr. John O'Grady. He has spent the hard but good years of a long life walking among the lowly. If any man in America knows the need for decent housing, for the clearance of the slums, for the strengthening of America by the furnishing of a wholesome home environment, this man of God is he.

Listen to these words, not my words, certainly not the dollar-cry of the real-estate lobby, but of this man who knows and who serves only for God and for humanity:

> The slum I saw in Chicago to me was utterly unbearable. I thought I had been through some of the toughest places in the world, in the jungles and in the mountains, and yet I could stand it; but after being in that slum in Chicago for about 2 hours, I had to quit.

What kind of a colleague of yours would I be if I remained silent, coming from Chicago, or accepted the word of the real-estate lobby that everything in Chicago in the way of housing contributed fully to the joy and happiness of everyone?

But, say the fine gentlemen of the real-estate lobby, if here and there is a blighted area, let the municipalities do the job of clearing it up. Fine talk from fine gentlemen. State and municipal governments have appropriated $55,000,000 for the job in Chicago. Overwhelmingly, at a referendum, the people of Chicago voted a bond issue of $30,000,000 for the purpose of slum clearance and relocation, and this despite their heavy tax burden, heavy because of the tremendous contribution that the tax money of Chicago makes to aid to agriculture, to great public works of direct benefit to the people in the southland and in the far West.

These contributions have been made without complaint. They have been made cheerfully because the men and women in Chicago, as in other large cities, have always had the concept that we belong to a family—the family of 48 States, our 3 Territories and 3 possessions—and that that which benefits one member of the family, benefits the entire family. Chicago and her sister cities, if you measure it dollar by dollar, have contributed many, many times to the expenditure of billions of dollars that have brought to the cities no direct benefit at all, than the money contributed by the regions deriving the direct benefit therefrom.

Does anyone in this Chamber believe that there is no end to patience? Is there a home anywhere within whose walls patience can endure forever, when some members of the family are always giving, giving, giving with sacrifice, and other members are always withholding, withholding, withholding in self-interest? How do we feel in Chicago and in the other urban centers, when we gladly give our money to clean up the slums of the cattle industry, and yet we present our own case for just a little help in cleaning up the slums of human-beings, and we get only the brush-off of the real-estate lobby.

In Chicago we were thrilled by what happened in Mexico when the hoof-and-mouth disease threatened the cattle industry. The border was closed and 500,000 Mexican cattle were slaughtered to prevent the disease from spreading. But the economy of Mexico could not stand the strain of a continued slaughter program. Although Mexico was not a member of our national family, nevertheless, the collapse of her economy would have had serious repercussions upon our own economy. So we formed, with Mexico, the Mexico-United States Commission for the eradication of hoof-and-mouth disease. We furnished most of the money—$2,000,000 per month.

Approximately 14,000,000 heads of Mexican cattle were vaccinated mostly at our expense—$2,000,000 a month. The first vaccinating has been completed. The recheck has failed to disclose a solitary head of diseased cattle. Because of this successful experiment we are now looking forward with confidence to the complete eradication of this dread disease in the 55 other nations of the world where hoof-and-mouth disease has contributed tremendously to the undernourishment of the people. It has been a tremendous contribution from America

to the health, the welfare, the happiness of all the people of the world.

Yet the fine gentlemen of the real-estate lobby, if they could have seen a dollar in its inception, would have fought it with the cry of state socialism, trespass upon free enterprise, and the best and latest of their verbal scarecrows, economy. Yes, Mr. Chairman, for several long years it cost us $2,000,000 per month of American money to clean up the cattle slums of Mexico. How can we view with complacency the objections of the real-estate lobby that would not give to the slums, where children are growing up, at least as much attention as we have given to the cattle slums?

Do not misunderstand me. I do not begrudge one cent that we have paid out to eradicate the hoof-and-mouth disease. But I cannot accept, for myself and for the men and women of Chicago, the taunt of $2,000,000 a month for slum clearance in the cattle industry and not one cent for slum clearance in the places where children live.

By cleaning up the cattle slums of Mexico we have added vastly to the food resources of the world. By cleaning up the slums where children live, we will be contributing to that greatest of all resources of any nation, its human resource.

Many of my years have been spent in countries defending human beings for whose blood there was popular hue and cry. Mine has been the profession of the lawyer, yes, the criminal lawyer, if you please, the criminal lawyer specializing in homicide cases, and I know, if anybody in all this wide world can know, the price that society pays because there are real-estate lobbies standing between decency and cleaning up the places where children grow up.

Do not tell me that these boys I have defended were one-half as guilty as a society that tolerates a real-estate lobby.

I remember too well the murder with a sawed-off shotgun, the murder of a clerk carrying the day's receipts in a department store in the city of Chicago. Who fired the gun? A boy of 20 who had been brought up in the slums of Chicago.

Yes, the boy of 20, confused and frustrated, to get the bread and the milk for his sister, dying of tuberculosis in the slums of Chicago, went out on his first excursion into crime with a sawed-off shotgun.

That is only one incident in the frustrating story of the slums of Chicago. That is the greatest of all reasons why I am here pleading with my colleagues to think twice and to say a prayer before they refuse to give to the children who live in slums that which they gave so generously to the cattle of the Mexican cattle slums.

I would sooner leave this Congress a defeated first-termer than go to bed for just one night with the conscience of a real-estate lobby.

But the real-estate lobby wants to talk in the language of dollars. Let us talk that language.

At the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, our own distinguished and brilliant colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], then in the Senate, being present, testimony was given on a survey compiled in Milwaukee. This careful work showed that 45 percent of the major crimes were of the slums; 60 percent of the juvenile delinquents; 60 percent of the tuberculosis victims. Milwaukee is a typical American city. Therefore I may reasonably accept the Milwaukee figures as likely to hold valid for the other cities of the country.

The slums, then, are responsible for 45 percent of our crime. An authority no less great than J. Edgar Hoover has estimated the total crime cost to the Nation for the current year of 1949 to be $15,000,000,000. Forty-five percent of $15,000,000,000 is $7,750,000,000. But the real-estate lobby has sought to scare my colleagues from undertaking the job of slum clearance by projecting the cost, under this legislation, for a period of 40 years. So let us take the cost of crime that comes from the slums in 40 years. The total would be about $310,000,000,000.

Sixty percent of the juvenile delinquents come from the slums. Juvenile delinquency, if not counteracted in every way possible, could bring us as a Nation to the ground with terrifying rapidity. If you want to do something to strike at the very heart of this problem, and to save the children of America, perhaps America herself, clean up the slums and start at once by voting for H. R. 4009.

But let us get back to the figures, the figures of dollars so close to the hearts of the gentlemen of the real-estate lobby.

Thirty-five percent of the fires in our cities occur in the slums. The total fire loss in the United States is approximately $600,000,000 per year. Thirty-five percent of $600,000,000 is $210,000,000 which, projected over 40 years, is $8,400,000,000.

I cannot give you the figures in dollars reflecting the cost to our citizens of disease and human ailments that come from the slums. In Milwaukee the cost per year to the municipal government for the care of each tubercular patient is $1,500. Governments, you see, do assume some responsibility for the care of victims of tuberculosis, and even my dear friend and colleague from the Thirteenth District of Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] and my distinguished colleague from the district of my nativity, the Fourth District of Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] would not call that socialism.

More unfortunate than the cost in dollars, I think, although I do not expect the real estate lobby to follow me in this, is the cost in human life. That cost I can give you with appalling accuracy. In 1946 there were, in the United States, 50,911 deaths from tuberculosis. Sixty percent of the tuberculosis cases occur in the slums. I do not know how many of the tuberculosis cases of the slums end in the cemeteries, but it is probable that in the slums few with tuberculosis recover and 60 percent of 50,911 is 30,546. We may conservatively say that the cost of the slums in human life from this one disease alone is between 25,000 and 30,000 men, women, and children a year.

I will not attempt even to estimate the number of persons who contract tuberculosis, a communicable disease, from tubercular patients coming from the slums, nor will I attempt to estimate the number of children in overprivileged districts who are caught in the net of juvenile delinquency because of associations that come from the slums.

But I do want to say to my colleagues, and to the fine gentlemen of the real estate lobby, that no man is safe, no woman is safe, no child is beyond the reach of danger while crime, death, and disease breed in our slums.

No, my colleagues, I will not sell out my constituents to the real estate lobby. I will not leave the children in the slums of my city without this voice lifted for their liberation. I will not follow the real estate lobby onto the hilltops where the promises are made, while men and women live in the slums and pay the cost in crime, disease, and death.

With many of my colleagues from all sections of our great United States, with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I march forward unafraid, in the faith that by doing the right thing and the decent thing for our less fortunate neighbors, we fulfill the destiny of our country and add to the contentment of our own lives. I am voting for H. R. 4009.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is of such great consequence to our national solvency and our philosophy of government that I would consider myself derelict in my duty, as the free representative of a free people, if I did not express my views on this proposed public housing program.

I do not intend to discuss the technical ramifications of the 84-page bill and 84-page committee report presently before us. It is to the basic issues presented by this legislation that I should like to direct your attention.

Let us set aside for the moment all consideration as to whether a Federal public housing program is needed or desirable. Let us agree that the stated objectives of the bill are worthy. Let us assume that the problem the bill seeks to solve is serious. Let us even assume that the bill will contribute toward a solution of the housing problem by providing better housing for those most in need. In short, let us assume that the bill has merit.

Assuming all that, it seems to me that the very first question we must ask ourselves: Is this something we can afford? I can think of many things of merit for which we might make expenditures. During my service on the Appropriations Committee I have on many occasions examined items of expenditure of value for which even larger amounts might be spent. But the question always is, or at least should be, not what we can spend on this program or that, but rather how much can be afford?

And so, I appeal to the Members of this House to consider this proposed program in the light of our existing fiscal situation and the additional financial burden the program would place on our already overstrained economy and overtaxed people. On this bill, and indeed on every

other bill that may come before us involving an increase in Federal spending, I urge, with all the emphasis I can command, that consideration be given to the size of our existing public debt, to the heavy taxes now being borne by the people, and to the fact that at this very moment we are faced with the prospects of an unbalanced budget.

Surely, however meritorious this or any other program may be said to be, we would be contributing nothing to the welfare of the people if by adopting such programs we produce national insolvency. Those who profess such great concern over public welfare would do well for improving the lot of the people if they devoted more attention to our Government's fiscal policy. If we are to have a happy, prosperous people, regularly employed at good wages, the very first requirement is that we have a stable fiscal policy.

Hon. James F. Byrnes, former Member of this House, former United States Senator, former War Mobilizer, former Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and former Secretary of State, uttered eloquent and grave words of warning in the address he delivered at Washington and Lee University last Saturday. He has had a background of experience in public affairs equaled by few and probably surpassed by none. I wish every American citizen would read and reflect on what he said on that occasion.

> Our first line of defense is not on the Rhine—

Said Secretary Byrnes—

> Our first line of defense is a sound, solvent American economy.

And he went on to say a few paragraphs later:

> In time of peace we should not resort to deficit financing. Business is dependent upon the stability of the Government's fiscal policy. When uncertainty and fear exist as to our fiscal policies, private enterprise abandons expansion programs, merchants purchase on a day-to-day basis, and prudent individuals spend only what is necessary. Unemployment results, and the Treasury can never provide sufficient relief employment to take care of all who are dismissed by private employers.

I wish I had the time to quote a number more paragraphs from that great speech by a great American—and, incidentally, a great Democrat—who has served with distinction in all three branches of the Government. We warned that these programs offered "in the name of public welfare" and made possible by Federal aid are "deceptive," that they lead us to "statism" where the individual is "an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

At this very moment we are in the midst of a business recession. Unemployment is increasing, and national income is decreasing. One of the contributing factors to this situation is the uncertainty and the fear that exists with respect to our Government's fiscal policy. The danger signals are up. We must cut expenditures and defer others.

And yet it is proposed by this bill before us today that we disregard these danger signals and proceed to commit this Government to a potential expenditure of $20,000,000,000, and perhaps more, over a period of 40 years. Surely we are not so lacking in political courage that we would risk the solvency of our country. If there were no other reason for rejecting this program, the fact that it is something we cannot afford is sufficient in itself. And we must have courage to tell the people that and not allow them to be blindly deluded by false promises.

There has been some argument as to how much this program will actually cost. Naturally, the proponents of this legislation try to minimize the cost, well knowing that the American people are today deeply concerned about the already high cost of Government. They point to the "reasonable estimate" which was prepared by the Budget Bureau and contend that the cost will only be between $9,000,000,000 and $10,000,000,000 over a 40-year period. But that figure does not include the grants-in-aid to slum clearance, nor does it include the contributions for farm housing, nor does it include the proposed outlays for research and administration.

The administration contends that only between $9,000,000,000 and $10,000,000,000, rather than the $16,000,000,000 authorized by this bill, will be required for low-rent housing. They thus argue in effect that all the money will not be used. That is just nonsense. I have yet to see a Federal agency that did not spend every cent allowed it by Congress, and in most cases they ask for more money at a subsequent date.

I readily concede that the nature of the program is such that no one can definitely say how much it will cost. But in passing on the program as representatives of the people we have to face the fact, which no one can possibly deny, that the bill before us today makes a commitment of approximately $20,000,000 for the program.

While around $20,000,000,000 is the potential cost to the Federal Government, let me remind you that it does not represent the total cost to the American people. The people also bear the cost of local governments, and the bill calls for local contributions. The money for local contributions will come from the pockets of the taxpayers, just as the money that the Federal Government spends comes from their pockets.

And there is another item of cost to the property-owning taxpayers which should be taken into account but which, I fear, is generally overlooked. The bill provides that each project shall be exempt from the taxes imposed by the State or local governments. That obviously means the person who owns his own home, or is paying for one, must bear the cost of the police and fire protection, sewage facilities, and all the other services of the local government that will necessarily be provided for the public-housing projects.

Regardless of what figure one may use in his calculation, it must be recognized that this program will place a substantial additional tax burden on the people. And I think it must also be recognized that those who are advocating this program look upon it as only a beginning.

I call your attention to the testimony of Mr. John W. Edelman, representing the CIO committee on housing, when he appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee as an advocate of this bill. You will find at page 264 of the committee hearings this statement:

> We point out that the number of units prescribed in H. R. 4009 seems to us to be inadequate, but the CIO, for once, would like to demonstrate that it can be reasonable and conservative, and just for the sake of unanimity we will go along and not make any objections to the curtailment of the number of units here. We feel very strongly that, once this program is under way, it will develop sufficient political momentum, such a strong pressure from the public at large, that there will be no necessity for us to argue energetically for such extensions of the program as may be needed from time to time.

Mr. Edelman is to be commended for his frankness. He frankly admits that this program is intended to be only the beginning. By implication he admits that the program has great political potentialities for the establishment of a welfare state and for the perpetuation of political power.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the program has grown in size and cost even without legislation. The bill that was passed by the Senate last year, but was not acted on by this House, provided for 500,000 units. The bill that passed the Senate this year provided for 810,000 units. The bill reported by our committee and is before us today provides for 1,050,000 units. This in itself shows how programs of this nature constantly grow and grow.

If this bill is passed, I venture the prediction that the $20,000,000,000 cost figure which the sponsors now contend is an exaggeration of the cost of the program will, in the end, prove to be a gross understatement. By the passage of this bill we will be entering upon a program much more costly than any of us now can visualize.

By the very terms of the bill before us the Congress will have no control over the expenditures. We simply authorize the executive branch of the Government to enter upon a multibillion-dollar program. I call your special attention to how the program is to be financed. This is not a program where the agency involved will get annual appropriations from Congress and by the use of our power to reduce or increase expenditures we can control the progress of the program.

By the very terms of this bill the Congress is granting to the Housing Administrator the right to incur a debt with the full faith and credit of the United States behind it. The money for the program is to be raised by debt transactions rather than by appropriations. The bill provides that the Housing Administrator may issue notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations as he decides. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase these notes and other obligations. In making the purchases the Secretary of the Treasury is

authorized to use the proceeds from the sale of any securities under the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Obviously, this procedure bypasses the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress. By the mere passage of this bill we will be making a definite commitment of an expenditure for over 40 years. We will be giving up one of our must fundamental prerogatives. The only control we will have over the expenditures to be made in this program will be the item of administrative expense and that for research.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot approve a program that will, in the face of the Nation's precarious financial situation, add this additional sum, whether it be $10,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000, to the cost of Government. This is something which we cannot afford. Nor can I approve a program of this character where it is proposed that the Congress relinquish its fundamental right to control the respective expenditures.

That brings me to the second point I wish to emphasize. Entirely aside from the cost involved in terms of dollars, the program advanced by this bill represents a complete departure from our philosophy of government. If we adopt the policy enunciated by this bill, we will be taking one more step toward socialism.

Instead of endeavoring to devise ways and means by which our great system of private competitive enterprise can do the job that is to be done, by this bill we are proposing that the Government itself do the job. There has been growing in this country a philosophy that, slowly but surely, is destroying the moral and spiritual fiber of our people. Instead of our people asking, what can I do to improve myself and my community, or what can I do for my Government, in growing numbers and with ever-increasing tempo, the people are asking, what can my Government do for me?

That is not the philosophy of government that made this the richest and strongest country in the world. It is not the philosophy of government that has given our people the highest standard of living enjoyed by any people anywhere.

Mark these words of Secretary Byrnes in his speech last Saturday, to which I previously referred:

> We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up on one can tell. But if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted, there is danger that the individual—whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state.

It is down the road to statism that this bill takes us. The ultimate result of such programs as this will be the nationalization of land and homes. The question we have to ask ourselves is this: Should homes be owned by the people, or should we have Government ownership? That is the underlying philosophy of government issue which this bill presents.

No one will deny there is a housing shortage. This is due to a number of factors. It is not due to any fault or failure of private enterprise. During the war period, because of the shortage of men and materials, there was very little building. At the same time there was an increase in the number of marriages and families, a shifting of the population from farms to cities and an increase in earnings. In other words, while the construction of homes and apartments was abnormally low the demand increased abnormally fast.

The program proposed by this bill is not the solution. The existing housing shortage is merely the excuse which the socialistic planners use to put their nationalization plans into effect. Some good, well-meaning people have been lead to believe that the passage of this legislation will almost overnight provide homes for their relatives or friends or neighbors. Insofar as the present housing shortage is concerned, the bill can do nothing in less than 2 years toward alleviating the shortage. And so all this talk about the existing housing shortage being relieved by this proposed legislation is propaganda, designed to sell this socialistic government housing scheme to the people.

In the meantime, private enterprise is itself licking the housing problem. Last year almost 1,000,000 new permanent dwelling units were built. That is a larger number than ever constructed in the entire history of the United States. This building boom was generated by the removal of the wartime restrictions and controls on the building industry by the Eightieth Congress.

In a word, the solution to the housing shortage is the continuation of the record building program now under way. As more and more homes are built, the prices will become lower. Private enterprise, free from Government restrictions and controls, free from the deadening hand of bureaucracy, is doing this job.

But if our Federal Government enters upon a public housing program, in competition with private enterprise, the number of housing units built by private enterprise will slowly but surely decrease. Such has been the experience in Great Britain with such programs as proposed here, and it will be our experience here in the United States.

Private enterprise cannot compete with Government-subsidized houses. Government-built houses, owned by the Government, managed by the Government with part of the rent paid by taxes paid by all the people to the Government, will serve, inevitably, to discourage individual home ownership. A program of this character strikes at the American tradition of home ownership, thrift, and individual incentives.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely urge upon this House that earnest consideration be given to the dollar cost of this proposed program. I say it is something we cannot afford. I also urge this House to give earnest consideration to the radical departure from our fundamental philosophy of government which this bill represents. I say that this program will take us further down the road to state socialism.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Chairman, I include as part of my statement Resolution No. 8530, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing Congress to write into law an adequate housing bill.

Mr. Chairman, I listened last Sunday evening to an interesting debate on Federal housing over the radio, between three distinguished Members of this House and a Member of the other body. During the debate the word "socialism" was freely used by the adversaries of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, long in advance of the memory of the younger Members of this body the word "socialism" was used in an attempt to defeat humanitarian legislation.

In 1907, while a member of the California State Senate, I was the author of a constitutional amendment providing for workmen's compensation. It was referred to as socialism at the time. It was necessary for my amendment to be submitted to the people of the entire State for ratification, and it was ratified by an overwhelming majority. California was one of the first, if not the very first State to enact workmen's compensation laws. Since that time workmen's compensation laws have been written into the statutes of nearly every State in this Union. At the same session of the California legislature there was authorized a Statewide bond issue for good roads which was also approved by the people of the State by an overwhelming majority, and placed California at the head of the list of States providing for good roads. This likewise was referred to by some as socialism.

Mr. Chairman, from 1945 to 1948 this country sent 21,744 prefabricated houses to Britain, France, India, the Philippines and Japan. All of these prefabricated houses were of wooden construction and this number does not include prefabricated houses of steel construction. Does the shipment of these badly needed homes out of the United States to foreign countries, and for which we will receive no compensation whatever, constitute socialism? If so, we are nearly all guilty.

Mr. Chairman, some would have it that this country is headed for a depression. I do not share in that thought. If, however, fate should decree another depression with resultant unemployment, we should have a well-thought-out building program. It will be recalled that there was a waste of untold hundreds of millions of dollars during the last depression by reason of the fact that we were not prepared for it. It might have been nipped in the bud had we followed the advice of former Congressman and former Vice President, John Nance Garner, who brought a building program to this floor, but unfortunately his advice was not accepted. Our country needs more houses for the great middle class and by all means let us have a well-planned building program, including, particularly, low-priced housing. Therefore this bill should pass.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution referred to reads as follows:

Resolution 8530

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill known as the Housing Act of 1949, which has been favorably reported to the Senate as S. 1070

by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency; and

Whereas said bill, if enacted into law, is to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, a national program of housing research, and a decennial census of housing, and for other purposes; and

Whereas it is to the best interest of the city and county of San Francisco that said bill be enacted into law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco does hereby wholeheartedly endorse the Housing Act of 1949, and memorializes the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded immediately to his honor, the mayor, for transmittal to the Federal legislative Representative and presentation by the latter to Senators DOWNEY and KNOWLAND, and Congressmen WELCH and HAVENNER, with the request that all necessary action be taken to assure enactment of the Housing Act of 1949.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco at its meeting of April 11, 1949.

JOHN R. MCGRATH, *Clerk*.

Approved, April 12, 1949.

ELMER E. ROBINSON, *Mayor*.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4009) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4878. An act to authorize certain Government printing, binding, and blank-book work elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office, if approved by the Joint Committee on Printing.

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

S. 1742. An act removing certain restrictions imposed by the act of March 8, 1888, on certain lands authorized by such act to be conveyed to the trustees of Porter Academy.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1794. An act to repeal certain obsolete provisions of law relating to the naval service.

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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3083) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendments numbered 5, 6, and 7 to the above-entitled bill and asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. CORDON, Mr. REED, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a number of newspaper articles concerning the exploits of the Butte (Mont.) High School Band.

Mr. SUTTON (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. DAVIES of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. CAVALCANTE, for the remainder of the present week, on account of official business.

To Mr. BREEN (at the request of Mr. MCSWEENEY), for 1 week, upon the recommendation of his physician.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 115. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 230. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sonia Kaye Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 447. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to regulate the transportation, packing, marking, and description of explosives and other dangerous articles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 471. An act for the relief of Lloyd Gordon Findley and Malcolm Hearne Findley, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 509. An act to provide for the advancement of Commissioned Warrant Officer Chester A. Davis, United States Marine Corps (retired) to the rank of lieutenant colonel on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 622. An act for the relief of Isaiah Johnson; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

S. 771. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 803. An act to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the State of Maryland for use as a site for a National Guard armory and for training the National Guard or for other military purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 897. An act for the relief of William Henry Tickner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 974. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to certain mothers of veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 980. An act for the relief of Toshie Okutomi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1003. An act for the relief of Emory T. Wales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1076. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act on March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1278. An act to fix the United States share of project costs, under the Federal Airport Act, involved in installation of high-intensity lighting on CAA-designated instrument-landing runways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1279. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to provide that minimum rates of wages need be specified only in contracts in excess of $2,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1280. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to limit to 10 percent any increase of the amount stated as a maximum obligation under a grant agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1283. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in, or in close proximity to, national parks, monuments, and recreation areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1285. An act to authorize progressive partial payments to sponsors under the Federal Airport Act program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1405. An act to provide for the admission to, and the permanent residence in, the United States of Poon Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1429. An act for the relief of Lacey C. Zapf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1507. An act to amend section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946, relating to the receipt of pay, allowances, or other expenses while drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1560. An act to authorize the appointment of Col. Kenneth D. Nichols, O17498, professor of the United States Military Academy, in the permanent grade of colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1578. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to proceed with the construction of stations of the Alaska Communications System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1639. An act to amend section 1452, Revised Statutes, relating to Presidential action on the proceedings and decisions of Navy retiring boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1742. An act removing certain restrictions imposed by the act of March 8, 1888, on certain lands authorized by such act to be conveyed to the trustees of Porter Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1977. An act to extend the time within which legislative employees may come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2010. An act to extend for 2 years the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs respecting leases and leased property; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, 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. 1096. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Linzay;

H. R. 1125. An act for the relief of Ellis C. Wagner and Barbara P. Wagner;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of June C. Dollar; and

H. R. 4471. An act to regulate the hours of duty and the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 41. An act for the relief of the city of Reno, Nev.;

S. 646. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 54,39 relating to the badge of the American Legion;

S. 647. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary;

S. 676. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion; and

S. 1089. An act to amend section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, relating to marketing agreements and orders, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue orders under such section with respect to filberts and almonds.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 21, 1949, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3967. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1950; and

H. R. 4046. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 23, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

707. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to coordinate the arrangements for the employment of agricultural workers admitted for temporary agricultural employment from foreign countries in the Western Hemisphere, to assure that the migration of such workers will be limited to the minimum numbers required to meet domestic labor shortages, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

708. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize annual and sick leave with pay for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, to authorize the payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave in excess of 60 days, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

709. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. PETERSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 2989. A bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 870). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee of conference. H. R. 4392. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor (Rept. No. 877). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILES: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4755. A bill to authorize the appointment of an Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1028. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Edmea Pacho; without amendment (Rept. No. 871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee of the Judiciary. H. R. 1038. A bill for the relief of William Richard Geoffrey Malpas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1447. A bill for the relief of Ethel Roth; without amendment (Rept. No. 873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Skio Takayama Hull; without amendment (Rept. No. 874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1861. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong; without amendment (Rept. No. 875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2602. A bill for the relief of John B. Boyle; with an amendment (Rept. No. 876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 5279. A bill to extend indefinitely the period in which title I of the Agricultural Act of 1948 shall be applicable; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5280. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in lands beneath inland navigable waters and to the recognition of equities in submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 5281. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5282. A bill to amend section 3 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 5283. A bill to extend indefinitely the period in which title I of the Agricultural Act of 1948 shall be applicable; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5284. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnostic, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5285. A bill to provide additional compensation, in lieu of overtime pay, for certain Federal employees engaged in criminal law enforcement work; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PICKETT (by request):

H. R. 5286. A bill to provide controls over subject matter, documents, other written instruments, materials, and records constituting personnel records consisting of the individual records of officers and employees of the Federal Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to invest officers and employees with authority to examine their individual personnel records; to provide penalties for misfeasance and/or malfeasance in administering and/or applying this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 5287. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 90, to create a Swainsboro division in the southern district of Georgia, with terms of court to be held at Swainsboro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 5288. A bill to create the Veterans' Insurance Corporation Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 5289. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAMSAY (by request):

H. R. 5290. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5291. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of moderate-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 5292. A bill to expedite the payment of the special dividend in the national service life insurance fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 5293. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of moderate-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 5294. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to extend until June 30, 1950, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs relative to conveyances for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. J. Res. 280. Joint resolution to relieve the world shortage of fertilizer nitrogen for agricultural purposes by providing for production and distribution of nitrogenous fertilizer materials by the Army during the fiscal year 1949–50; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. Res. 262. Resolution to commend J. Edgar Hoover for his service to the country and to express the complete confidence of the House of Representatives in the conduct of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. Res. 263. Resolution relative to charges made by President Truman against representatives of the real-estate and home-building industries; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 5295. A bill for the relief of C. R. Springman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 5296. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Mayer, Jetty Mayer, Carl Gellmann, and Hertha Gellmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5297. A bill for the relief of Fredy Kohn, Anna Kohn, and Hugo Ronald Kohn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 5298. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Francesca Fiorenza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 5299. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giovanna Follo Discepolo and her three children; 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:

1128. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of United Irish-American Societies of New York, urging amendment of article 4 of the Atlantic Pact regarding partition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1129. Also, petition of the American Legion, Bronx County, N. Y., supporting H. R. 2193, a bill which provides for waiver of certain physical requirements in the cases of certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1130. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Gertrude Wiley and others, South Bend, Ind., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1131. Also, petition of Mrs. Mary Hoffnagle and others, Philadelphia, Pa., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1132. Also, petition of the Townsend Plan for National Insurance, Independence, Mo., transmitting petition of Oliver C. Houston and others requesting passage of H. R. 2165 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1133. Also, petition of Mrs. Rosa Varner and others, Austin, Tex., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1134. Also, petition of C. H. McCormick and others, Houston, Tex., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1135. Also, petition of R. W. Nance and others, Tumwater, Wash., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1136. Also, petition of Phil B. Sheridan and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 23, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we come in the assurance not of our feeble hold of Thee but of Thy mighty grasp of us. We thank Thee for the sweet refreshment of sleep, restoring the frayed edges of care, and for the beckoning glory and the fresh vigor of the new day.

Across all its toiling hours, O Thou great companion of our souls, keep our hearts with Thee as once more our faces are set toward vexing social problems which tax our utmost to solve.

May we march with conquering tread in the gathering armies of friendship whose armor is the shield of Thy truth and whose sword is the might of Thy love, against which all the spears of hate cannot ultimately prevail.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 22, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Anderson	Hill	Morse
Baldwin	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Butler	Ives	Pepper
Cain	Jenner	Reed
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Connally	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kerr	Sparkman
Donnell	Kilgore	Taft
Douglas	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McCarran	Thye
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tobey
Flanders	McClellan	Tydings
Frear	McFarland	Watkins
Gillette	McGrath	Wiley
Graham	McKellar	Williams
Green	Martin	Withers
Hayden	Maybank	Young
Hendrickson	Miller	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the delegation of the United States of America to the Second World Health Organization Assembly, which is meeting in Rome, Italy.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent on official business, presiding at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with an investigation of the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of illness.

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

Mr. TAFT. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent on account of illness.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California