

(Rept. No. 2200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2556. An act for the relief of Mrs. Billy J. Knight and Dorothea Knight; without amendment (Rept. No. 2201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2629. An act for the relief of Marianne Bruchner; without amendment (Rept. No. 2202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2714. An act for the relief of Thomas Pfeiffer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7079. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gin Shibasaki Okafuji; with amendment (Rept. No. 2204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7820. A bill for the relief of Keiko Uchida and her minor child; with amendment (Rept. No. 2205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7970. A bill for the relief of Regina Watanabe (Mrs. Regina Anderson); with amendment (Rept. No. 2206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8440. A bill for the relief of Noae Kawashima; without amendment (Rept. No. 2207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8451. A bill for the relief of Yoshie Nozawa; without amendment (Rept. No. 2208). 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. MORRIS:

H. R. 8762. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Cobb Creek reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 8763. A bill to amend the Clayton Act with respect to the recovery of triple damages under the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 8764. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 8765. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

H. R. 8766. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 8767. A bill to authorize the exclusion from the mails of all obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile articles, matters, things, devices, or substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 8768. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. Res. 635. Resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. Res. 636. Resolution directing the Secretary of State to call upon the United Nations to investigate shooting down of American Navy plane by Russian airmen on April 8, 1950, and to request United Nations to impose punishment as provided in its Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 637. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 638. Resolution to create a Committee To Investigate the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to federalize the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 8769. A bill for the relief of Annmarie Stritter and her minor daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 8770. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware (by request):

H. R. 8771. A bill for the relief of Maria Sulikowska Forbes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 8772. A bill for the relief of Ah-Kim Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 8773. A bill for the relief of Chiyako Ozama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 8774. A bill for the relief of Yoshie Murakami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 8775. A bill for the relief of Loreto Marino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 8776. A bill for the relief of the Birmingham Ferry Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8777. A bill to renew patent No. 1,906,593, issued May 2, 1933, relating to sanitation equipment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 8778. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 8779. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lula Huggins Winger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 8780. A bill for the relief of Leila M. Dodd; 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:

2188. By the SPEAKER: Petition of F. A. Pierson, secretary, Nebraska State Dental Association, Lincoln, Nebr., opposing enactment of any legislation favoring the principle of any form of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2189. Also, petition of Joseph E. Nesbitt, president, Public Forum of Spokane, Spokane, Wash., relative to the passing of Hon. John Lesinski, of Michigan, and conveying deep sympathy; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 7, 1950)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Conrad Bergendoff, president, Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O Lord who dost guide the course of nations toward Thine own eternal goal:

We pray Thee for the vision of Thy will and for light to take the next step on Thy way.

We thank Thee for the goodly heritage of our beloved land and for our opportunities at this moment of history.

We pray Thee that amid the tumult of the crowded day our minds may be responsive to the promptings of Thy spirit.

So that Thou mayest lead us to hallow Thy name in the earth and to bring to men the kingdom of Thy Son our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 8, 1950, 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. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 8, 1950, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 3118) relating to the forwarding and return of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, the collection of postage due at the time of delivery, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8575) to provide emergency cotton allotments to producers of farm commodities whose 1950 crops have been substantially destroyed by natural causes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. TOBEY were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

| | | |
|----------|-------------|--------------|
| Bridges | Hendrickson | McKellar |
| Butler | Ives | Mundt |
| Cain | Kerr | O'Mahoney |
| Douglas | Kilgore | Russell |
| Dowshak | Knowland | Saltonstall |
| Ferguson | Lehman | Smith, N. J. |
| Flanders | Lucas | Thye |
| George | McClellan | Wherry |
| Hayden | McFarland | Young |

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed by the President as a congressional adviser to the United States delegation at the fifth session of the general conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization now being held in Florence, Italy.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, attending the sessions of the International Labor Or-

ganization at Geneva, Switzerland, as a delegate representing the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the UNESCO Conference at Florence, Italy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Legislative Clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. ECTON, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators, so that we may obtain a quorum.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. FREAR, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. KEM, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. WITHERS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today he affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 274. An act for the relief of Constantin E. Aramescu;

S. 356. An act for the relief of Hugo Geiger;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Emma L. Jackson;

S. 749. An act for the relief of Ferd H. Gibling;

S. 764. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.;

S. 765. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust;

S. 766. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.;

S. 947. An act for the relief of the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc.;

S. 977. An act for the relief of Jacques Yedid, Henriette Yedid, and Ethel Danielle Yedid;

S. 1146. An act for the relief of Francis W. Dodge;

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Alex Morn-ingstar;

S. 1510. An act for the relief of James I. Bartley;

S. 1693. An act for the relief of Karin Margaret Hellen and Olof Christer Hellen;

S. 1798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minda Moore;

S. 1856. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria Rita Rossi, Maria Domenica Paone, Rachele Orlando, Assunta Roselli, Rosa Innocenti, and Maria Mancinelli;

S. 1863. An act for the relief of Fremont Rider;

S. 1929. An act for the relief of Anna Samudovsky;

S. 2070. An act for the relief of the Clark Funeral Home;

S. 2108. An act for the relief of Italo Vespa de Chellis;

S. 2156. An act for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Clara Weskamp;

S. 2338. An act for the relief of J. M. Arthur;

S. 2339. An act for the relief of the Davis Grocery Co., of Oneida, Tenn.;

S. 2385. An act for the relief of Edward C. Ritchie;

S. 2611. An act for the relief of Roland Roger Alfred Boccia, also known as Roland Barbera;

S. 2646. An act for the relief of the Articaire Refrigeration Co.; and

S. 3090. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg) Charles W. Ireland, Supply Corps, United States Navy, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO USE OF PETROLEUM AS FUEL ABOARD STEAM VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the use of petroleum as fuel aboard steam vessels (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO MAILING OF OBSCENE MATTER

A letter from the Postmaster General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, 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 detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law and the reasons for granting such status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO RADU CONSTANTINE FORTUNESCU

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the order of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, granting the status of permanent residence to Radu Constantine Fortunesco, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law and the reason for granting such status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, together with copies of the annual reports of the city of New York, the board of commissioners of the port of New Orleans, and the board of State harbor commissioners for the port of San Francisco, covering operations for the calendar year 1948 of foreign-trade zones Nos. 1, 2, and 3 at the above respective ports (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

INTERIM REPORT OF CHIEF OF WEATHER BUREAU

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting to law, the second interim report by the Chief of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce on the study of causes and characteristics of thunderstorms (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Resolution 10

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to federalize the practice of medicine

"Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the finest standards of scientific care, and the best quality of medical institutions thus far achieved by any major country in the world; and

"Whereas the great accomplishments of American medicine are the results of a free profession working under a free system unhampered by Government control; and

"Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical care has been a progressive deterioration of the standards and quality of that

care to the serious detriment of the sick and the needy: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana, a majority of the members elected agreeing thereto—

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized not to enact any proposed legislation the effect of which will be to bring the practice of medicine in this country under Federal direction and control, either through a form of compulsory insurance or any system of medical care designed for national bureaucratic control.

"2. The Senators and Representatives from Louisiana now in the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to bend their every effort and utilize all facilities at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

"3. Copies of this resolution shall forthwith be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Senator and Congressman from Louisiana.

"WILLIAM J. DODD,
Lieutenant Governor and President
of the Senate."

A resolution adopted by the Midwest District Council of the Japanese-American Citizens League, at Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the allocation of \$304,800 for administrative expenses to permit the Department of Justice to carry out the provisions of the Evacuation Claims Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Montana Stockgrowers Association, at Billings, Mont., endorsing the efforts to balance the Federal budget; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A resolution adopted by the Nebraska State Dental Association, Lincoln, Nebr., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Midwest District Council of the Japanese-American Citizens League, at Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring prompt action by the Senate to pass House Joint Resolution 238, to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence; ordered to lie on the table.

SHIPMENT OF MUNITIONS THROUGH CITY OF SOUTH AMBOY AND MIDDLESEX COUNTY, N. J.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself, I present a memorial to the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General of the United States of America, the Governor of the State of New Jersey, and the United States Senators and Representatives from New Jersey, in protest against the shipment of munitions through the city of South Amboy or any other area of Middlesex County, N. J.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorial may be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD with the signatures attached, as follows:

MEMORIAL TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY, AND THE UNITED STATES SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES FROM NEW JERSEY IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN PROTEST AGAINST THE SHIPMENT OF MUNITIONS THROUGH THE CITY OF SOUTH AMBOY OR ANY OTHER AREA OF MIDDLESEX COUNTY, N. J.

To the Honorable Louis A. Johnson, the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, the Honorable Alfred E. Driscoll, the Honorable H. Alexander Smith, the Honorable Robert C. Hendrickson, the Honorable Charles A. Wolvertson, the Honorable T. Millet Hand, the Honorable James C. Auchincloss, the Honorable Charles R. Howell, the Honorable Charles A. Eaton, the Honorable Clifford P. Case, the Honorable William B. Widnall, the Honorable Gordon Canfield, the Honorable Harry L. Towe, the Honorable Peter W. Rodino, Jr., the Honorable Hugh J. Addonizio, the Honorable Robert W. Kean, the Honorable Mary T. Norton, the Honorable Edward J. Hart.

SIRS: The Middlesex County (N. J.) Mayors Association, a duly organized group of the municipal representatives of the people of the County of Middlesex, N. J., respectfully show unto your honors:

1. On Friday, May 19, 1950, an estimated 427 tons of antitank and antipersonnel mines and other munitions exploded at the port of South Amboy in the course of a transshipment of cargo consigned from Newark, Ohio, and Rutherford, Pa., and destined for Pakistan. This cargo was shipped by rail to South Amboy's railhead, where it was unloaded into lighters in Raritan Bay for delivery to the Isbrandtsen liner *Flying Clipper*, which was waiting in lower New York Harbor to receive the cargo for foreign shipment.

2. At about 7:28 p. m. of the day aforesaid the cargo already in the lighters at the pier, the cargo being unloaded and that yet in readiness for unloading exploded, bringing death to 33 persons, injuring hundreds of others, and destroying and damaging property to an extent conservatively estimated at \$15,000,000.

3. The cause of this havoc has not been officially determined at this time. An investigation is now proceeding under the auspices of the United States Coast Guard. Other inquiries have been promised by officials of our Federal and State governments. Until these and other inquiries have come to an end, we are constrained to refrain from alleging particular criminal or civil liability.

4. We show you, however, that in South Amboy in particular (and these allegations have reference in varying degrees to the cities of Perth Amboy and New Brunswick and the Borough of Sayreville and South River and Raritan Township and the township of Woodbridge and all other sections of our county) our schools, both public and private, have been damaged to such an extent that they may have to be demolished and that present school terms have been abruptly terminated; that our churches have been rendered unusable and that religious services are being held in the open; that our municipal buildings may have to be torn down; that practically every house in South Amboy has been damaged, and many families made homeless; that several factories have had to close and many have been added to the unemployment rolls; that the people of South Amboy are shocked and fearful of a recurrence of this type of disaster.

5. We further show that this latest explosion is only one in a series of such catastrophes that have terrified this neighborhood for years, beginning with the Morgan explo-

sion of 1918 when hundreds were likewise killed and property damage ran into the millions.

6. This association believes that this shocking loss of life and property is entirely unnecessary in the future. At Earle, on lower Raritan Bay, the Government has the finest shipping facilities for explosives that the mind of man has yet been able to devise. We believe that it is to here that all necessary shipments of munitions should be made in the future.

7. We recommend, too, that all shipments of munitions, from the port of South Amboy, be immediately prohibited by law, and this prohibition be extended to the Raritan Arsenal and other similar storage and shipment locations in this county.

8. We further recommend that the Coast Guard inquiry which it is said is limited to ascertaining what happened and how it can be prevented, be extended, or that the inquiry be placed in the hands of other legal or governmental authorities for the purpose of definitely ascertaining and fixing criminal or civil liability for this disaster.

George L. Toms, Piscataway; August F. Greiner, Woodbridge; Thomas H. Lee, South Plainfield; John F. Fitzpatrick, South River; George J. Siegel, Spotswood; Stephen Skiba, Carteret; Wesley W. Perrine, Cranbury; Albert J. Roff, Dunellen; Charles F. Sullivan, East Brunswick Township; William H. Franklin, Helmetta; Alva H. Cole, Highland Park; Michael J. Seminara, Jamesburg; Joseph L. Costa, Metuchen; Louis Stoffell, Borough of Middlesex.

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN GERMANY— RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL FOR COMMUNITY ACTION, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Council for Community Action, a responsible organization in the city of New York, has adopted a resolution on Germany and has endorsed Senate Resolution 260, which calls for a study and review of current developments in Germany. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Council for Community Action join with CIO, AFL, ADL, ADA, and American Veterans Committee in signing and supporting the following statement on German democracy:

The establishment of a western German state and the end of military government in Germany mark the termination of the first phase of American occupation and require a critical appraisal of our policy in Germany.

In 4 years of military occupation, the formal elements for the creation of a free state have been established: parliamentary institutions, a free press, political parties, and independent labor movement, and a functioning economy. Yet the chief goals of American policy, the democratization of German life, assurance that its economy will not be used for aggression and the integration of Germany into the European democratic community are far from achievement. The extent to which these goals have been lost sight of is indicated by the re-emergence of extreme national political groups: The return of many former active Nazis and other extreme nationalists to important administrative and economic positions and the proposals for the creation of a German army. Such a revival of German

militarism would recreate the traditional foe of German democracy and would raise well-founded fears of German aggression in the western European community and would create danger of a new alliance between German militarists and the totalitarian communism of the East.

In view of the failures and disappointments of the past and the dangers inherent in the present situation in Germany, what is imperatively needed at this point is a full review by Congress and by a Presidential commission of the execution of American policy in Germany and the adoption of a positive program which will—

1. Strengthen the prodemocratic forces of Germany—the democratic labor movement, the cooperatives, the democratically constituted social welfare agencies, and the municipalities under effective popular control.

2. Eliminate all active supporters of the Nazis program from policy making and other positions of authority or responsibility in the administrative, judicial, and educational systems of the German government and in that connection the High Commission should bring its influence to bear to secure such action by the German Government and should apply this policy in reviewing its own past and future appointments.

3. Democratize the economy and curb the concentration of economic power in cartels and trusts.

4. Maintain such controls of the German economy as may be required to insure that, while Germany will contribute to European recovery and its people will enjoy an adequate standard of living, it shall never again become an aggressor. In that connection the coal, iron, and steel-producing facilities of the Ruhr should be developed in concert with the western European countries under a strict system of democratic controls, which must include full labor participation.

5. Facilitate the reeducation of the German people, especially its youth in a spirit of democratic and peaceful cooperation.

To carry out the purpose of this resolution, the Council for Community Action endorses the Lehman-Ives resolution calling for an investigation of American policy in Germany. We urge that this investigation be conducted by a representative citizen group.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 3571. A bill to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1783).

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

H. R. 6826. A bill to provide for the common defense through the registration and classification of certain male persons, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1784).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 9, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 274. An act for the relief of Constantin E. Aramescu;

S. 356. An act for the relief of Hugo Geiger;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Emma L. Jackson;

S. 749. An act for the relief of Ferd H. Gibling;

S. 764. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and

render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.;

S. 765. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust;

S. 766. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.;

S. 947. An act for the relief of the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc.;

S. 977. An act for the relief of Jacques Yedid, Henriette Yedid, and Ethel Danielle Yedid;

S. 146. An act for the relief of Francis W. Dodge;

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Alex Morn-ingstar;

S. 1510. An act for the relief of James I. Bartley;

S. 1693. An act for the relief of Karin Margareta Hellen and Olof Christer Hellen;

S. 1798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minda Moore;

S. 1856. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria Rita Rossi, Maria Domenica Paone, Rachele Orlando, Assunta Roselli, Rosa Innocenti, and Maria Mancinelli;

S. 1863. An act for the relief of Fremont Rider;

S. 1929. An act for the relief of Anna Samudovsky;

S. 2070. An act for the relief of the Clark Funeral Home;

S. 2108. An act for the relief of Italo Vespa de Chelis;

S. 2156. An act for the relief of Sister Ed-eltrudis Clara Weskamp;

S. 2338. An act for the relief of J. M. Arthur;

S. 2339. An act for the relief of the Davis Grocery Co. of Oneida, Tenn.;

S. 2385. An act for the relief of Edward C. Ritchie;

S. 2611. An act for the relief of Roland Roger Alfred Bocella, also known as Roland Barbera;

S. 2646. An act for the relief of the Artic-aire Refrigeration Co.; and

S. 3090. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg) Charles W. Ireland, Supply Corps, United States Navy, and for other purposes.

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. YOUNG:

S. 3725. A bill for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic; and

S. 3726. A bill for the relief of Tibor Wiener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3727. A bill to authorize certain construction at Griffiss Air Force Base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. McCLELLAN (by request) introduced Senate bill 3728, to implement Reorganization Plan No. 20 of 1950 by amending title 1 of the United States Code, as regards publication of the United States Statutes at Large, to provide for the publication of treaties and other international agreements between the United States of America and other countries in a separate compilation, to be known as United States Treaties and Other International Agreements, and for other purposes, which was referred to the

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 3729. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Holly River State Park to the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3730. A bill to authorize the sale of inherited interests in the allotment of Mary Shorty, deceased Winnebago allottee;

S. 3731. A bill to authorize the sale of the allotment of Edward Rave, deceased Winnebago allottee; and

S. 3732. A bill to authorize the sale of inherited interests in the allotment of Mike Shorty, deceased Winnebago allottee; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 3733. A bill for the relief of Dyonisios Christ Pavlatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to authorize the procurement of an oil portrait and a marble bust of the late Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 20 OF 1950—AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE PROVIDING FOR PUBLICATION OF TREATIES AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to implement Reorganization Plan No. 20 of 1950, by amending title 1 of the United States Code to provide for the publication of treaties and other international agreements, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Arkansas will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3728) to implement Reorganization Plan No. 20 of 1950 by amending title 1 of the United States Code, as regards publication of the United States Statutes at Large, to provide for the publication of treaties and other international agreements between the United States of America and other countries in a separate compilation, to be known as United States Treaties and Other International Agreements, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The statement presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR McCLELLAN

Mr. President, I am introducing a bill which has as its purpose the fulfillment of an undertaking begun and substantially accomplished by Reorganization Plan No. 20 of 1950, which became effective on May 24. In reporting out plan No. 20, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments directed attention to the need for this supplementary legislation and announced its intention to cause introduction of an appropriate bill.

Reorganization Plan No. 20 transferred from the State Department to the General Services Administration all functions related to the preservation, publication, and certi-

cation of acts of Congress, amendments to the Constitution of the United States, certificates of appointment and votes of electors of the President and Vice President of the United States and official papers of the Territories. Similar functions related to international agreements of all kinds and related Presidential proclamations were reserved to the Secretary of State.

A number of the many documents involved are accumulated and published as the Statutes at Large and, as a result of plan No. 20, we now have the responsibility for the issuance of the Statutes at Large divided between the General Services Administration, as to domestic matters, and the Department of State, as to international matters. To complicate the situation even further, the usual second volume of the Statutes at Large, as it is customarily compiled, has now become a joint responsibility of the two agencies.

I have been informed that present law requires that treaties and other international agreements and related proclamations be published on the basis of a session of the Congress. This may have been a practical arrangement in the early days of this country when treaties were comparatively simple and required ratification usually by no more than two countries. Now, however, an increasingly large proportion of international agreements are of a multilateral character requiring many signatures and many ratifications, and experience proves that by the time such an agreement or treaty is ready for proclamation it has lost all identity with any particular session of the Congress.

According to information submitted to me, this bill accomplishes three major and closely related objectives. First, it provides for removal of treaties and other international agreements and related proclamations from the Statutes at Large and for their publication under the auspices of the State Department in a separate volume to be entitled "United States Treaties and Other International Agreements." Second, it recognizes the lack of relationship which has come to exist between the proclamation of treaties and other international agreements and a session of the Congress by providing for their publication on the basis of those which have been proclaimed or otherwise formalized during each calendar year. Third, the bill makes the necessary provision for the admissibility as legal evidence of this new volume in the courts of the United States, of the several States, and of the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

It is my understanding that the bill, by authorizing the new volume, "United States Treaties and Other International Agreements," will permit elimination of any other compilations of documents of an international character which have heretofore been issued by the Government in addition to the Statutes at Large, and effect substantial reductions in printing costs, particularly in regard to the printing of the so-called "Malloy" volumes in which from time to time such international papers have been printed as Senate documents. This new volume will not only replace the present inclusion of such papers in the Statutes at Large, but may be expected to serve also as an individual reference volume free of the intermingling of entirely unrelated documents which is now a characteristic of the Statutes at Large.

I have been advised that the bill I am now introducing is a necessary implementation of the accomplishments of Reorganization Plan No. 20. That plan met with universal approval as a constructive step toward more efficient and more economical administration, and the enactment of this bill should go far toward completing that which the plan has begun.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that this bill has been formulated as a co-

operative effort with representatives of the State Department, which has endorsed the proposed legislation, and I have been assured it meets with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the General Services Administration, and the Public Printer.

MEDICAL SERVICES TO NON-INDIANS IN INDIAN HOSPITALS—AMENDMENT

During the delivery of Mr. CAIN's speech,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on a number of calendar calls last session I objected to the passage of House bill 4815, to provide for medical services to non-Indians in Indian hospitals, primarily because I believed that the rights of the Indian tribes were not sufficiently protected under the bill. Many Indian Bureau hospitals were built for Indians, frequently with Indian funds and with Indian labor, and frequently in pursuance of treaty obligations. It did not appear wise to me for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to have discretionary power to transfer those hospitals to local white communities unless the affected Indians are satisfied that the transfer would benefit all parties concerned. That should certainly be the case since the Congress appropriated the funds for the use of the Indians alone.

I am happy to say that after a series of discussions with the Department of the Interior, a satisfactory amendment has been arrived at which I am now pleased to submit. I trust that H. R. 4815 can now be passed quickly by the Senate and enacted into law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8575) to provide emergency cotton allotments to producers of farm commodities whose 1950 crops have been substantially destroyed by natural causes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MAGNA CARTA (S. DOC. NO. 180)

During the delivery of Mr. CAIN's speech,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Magna Carta, with appropriate commentary by Prof. Faith Thompson, associate professor of history at the University of Minnesota, printed as a Senate document. The Magna Carta is one of the cornerstones of our democratic ideology and way of life. It is the foundation of English law and jurisprudence. It is, therefore, fitting and proper that we pay tribute to this significant historical document by printing it as a Senate document.

I am proud to present the commentary by Prof. Faith Thompson, whose scholarship has earned for her the respect and high esteem of American and English historians. Professor Thompson is the author of the First Century of Magna Carta, published in 1925 by the University of Minnesota Press, and of Magna Carta, Its Role in the Making of English Constitution, also published by the University of Minnesota Press in 1948.

I request that my remarks be printed with the document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it's so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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 A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

J. Alston Adams, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 4 years, expiring June 30, 1954 (reappointment); and

Paul R. Rowen, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1955 (reappointment).

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY HON.

JAMES A. FARLEY AT SEATTLE UNIVERSITY AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY THE VERY REVEREND A. A. LEMIEUX

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record introductory remarks by the Very Reverend A. A. Lemieux, president of Seattle University, and the commencement address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, at Seattle University, on June 2, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

SENATOR MUNDT CHALLENGES US—EDITORIAL FROM THE SAVANNAH (GA.) MORNING NEWS

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Senator Mundt Challenges Us," published in the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News of June 4, together with a short statement prepared by himself, which appear in the Appendix.]

RURAL NONFARM HOUSING—SPEECH BY REV. THOMAS B. KEEHN AND STATEMENT BY REV. WILLIAM J. GIBBONS

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a speech entitled "Public Housing Current Issues—What Has Happened to the Rural Nonfarm Program?" by Rev. Thomas B. Keehn, delivered at the nineteenth annual meeting of the National Housing Conference, in New York City, on April 3, 1950; and a statement entitled "Rural Nonfarm Housing," by Rev. William J. Gibbons, at the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, on April 26, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

BRANNAN ROW WITH NEWSMEN OVER EGGS ON A COMIC LEVEL—ARTICLE BY PHILLIP WARDEN

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Brannan Row With Newsmen Over Eggs on a Comic Level," written by Phillip Warden, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of June 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAGIC FORMULA—EDITORIAL FROM THE MOBERLY (MO.) MESSAGE

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Magic Formula," published in the Moberly (Mo.) Message, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERASIA CASE—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial relating to the Amerasia case and Senator FERGUSON's speech thereon, published in the Washington Times-Herald of Thursday, June 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PHILIPPINES AND THE COMMUNISTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW HAMPSHIRE MORNING UNION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "The Same Chatter We Heard About China," relating to Communist activities in the Philippines, published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of June 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a report by him to the people of Pennsylvania, dated June 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address by him on social security, No. 28 in a biweekly series of broadcasts over Pennsylvania radio stations, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS TO EACH MEMBER NATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received from the organization called the Association for the United Nations a copy of a letter addressed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to each member nation. This letter includes a memorandum containing a 10-point program for achieving peace through the United Nations.

I do not necessarily subscribe to all the observations and proposals made by the distinguished Secretary-General of the United Nations but I consider these proposals to be certainly worthy of study by every Member of the United States Senate and by the American people.

Because of this I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter and of the attached memorandum be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TO EACH MEMBER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Sr: The deterioration of relations between leading members of the United Nations has created a situation of most serious concern for the United Nations and the future peace of the world. In my capacity as Secretary-General, I have felt it my duty to suggest means by which the principles of the Charter and the resources of the United Nations could be employed to moderate the present conflict and to enable a fresh start to be made toward eventual peaceful solutions of outstanding problems.

To this end, I have drawn up a memorandum of points for consideration in the development of a 20-year program for achieving peace through the United Nations, a copy of which is annexed hereto.

I have personally handed this memorandum to the President of the United States of America, Mr. Harry S. Truman, on April 20, to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Clement Attlee, on April 28; to the Prime Minister of France, Mr. Georges Bidault, on May 3; and to the Prime Minister

of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Generalissimo Joseph Stalin, on May 15. I had opportunity to discuss the points of this memorandum with the foregoing heads of governments and with other leaders of their governments including the Secretary of State of the United States of America, Mr. Dean Acheson, the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Mr. Ernest Bevin; the Foreign Minister of France, Mr. Robert Schuman; the Vice Premier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Vacheslav Molotov; and the Foreign Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Andrei Vishinsky.

While it would not be appropriate for me to state the views of any of the governments on the points of the memorandum, I can say that I have drawn from my conversations a firm conviction that the United Nations remain a primary factor in the foreign policy of each of these Governments and that the reopening of genuine negotiations on certain of the outstanding issues may be possible.

It is evident that no significant progress can be made while the members of the United Nations remain sharply divided on the question of the representation of one of the permanent members of the Security Council—the Republic of China. It is necessary that this question be settled.

Under point 2 of the annexed memorandum I have made a number of suggestions for resumption of negotiations on the problems of atomic energy. Another suggestion was made in the appeal circulated on April 20, 1950, by the International Committee of the Red Cross to the high contracting parties to the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of Victims of War, to do everything in their power to reach agreements on the prohibition of the atomic bomb and blind weapons generally.

In connection with point 7, the conversations of the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe, Mr. Gunnar Myrdal, with various European governments have emphasized the necessity for further efforts to liberate international trade from the restrictions and discriminatory practices which now hamper the free flow of goods.

Further in connection with point 7 I call your attention to the statement unanimously adopted in Paris on May 4, 1950, by the Administrative Committee on Coordination (composed of the Secretary-General and the administrative heads of the following specialized agencies: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, International Labor Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, World Health Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Monetary Fund, International Refugee Organization, International Telecommunications Union, International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union, Interim Commission of the International Trade Organization). The statement reads:

"The present division of the world and the increasingly serious conflicts of policy among the great powers have gravely impaired the prospects for world peace and for raising the standards of living of the peoples of the world. It is of particular concern to the administrative heads of the organizations that these conditions threaten the very basis of their work. The United Nations and the specialized agencies are founded upon the principles that lasting world problems—like disease, hunger, ignorance, and poverty, which recognize no frontier—can never be overcome unless all the nations join in universal efforts to these ends. We affirm the validity of this principle of universality.

"The United Nations system makes ample room for diversity within a universal framework. We believe it would be a disaster if efforts to realize the principle of universality in practice were to be abandoned now. We believe that the greatest efforts should, on

the contrary, be directed toward achieving in fact true universality in the membership and programs of the United Nations and of those of the specialized agencies which are founded on that principle. We also believe that it is necessary for all the governments to renew their efforts to conciliate and negotiate the political differences that divide them and obstruct economic and social advancement. Specifically, we believe that it is essential to the future of both the United Nations and the specialized agencies that the present political deadlock in the United Nations be resolved at the earliest possible moment. The peace and well-being of all peoples demand from their governments a great and sustained new effort by the nations of the world to achieve a constructive and durable peace."

I have the honor to request the earnest attention of your Government to the annexed memorandum. I have in contemplation the possibility of its formal submission to the Security Council at an appropriate time, and I reserve the right to place it on the provisional agenda of the forthcoming regular session of the General Assembly.

I have the honor to be, etc.

Secretary-General.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS FOR CONSIDERATION
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 20-YEAR PROGRAM
FOR ACHIEVING PEACE THROUGH THE UNITED
NATIONS

As Secretary-General, it is my firm belief that a new and great effort must be attempted to end the so-called cold war and to set the world once more on a road that will offer greater hope of lasting peace.

The atmosphere of deepening international mistrust can be dissipated and the threat of the universal disaster of another war averted by employing to the full the resources for conciliation and constructive peace building present in the United Nations Charter. The employment of these resources can secure eventual peace if we accept, believe, and act upon the possibility of peaceful coexistence among all the great powers and the different economic and political systems they represent, and if the great powers evidence a readiness to undertake genuine negotiation—not in a spirit of appeasement—but with enlightened self-interest and common sense on all sides.

Measures for collective self-defense and regional remedies of other kinds are at best interim measures, and cannot alone bring any reliable security from the prospect of war. The one common undertaking and universal instrument of the great majority of the human race is the United Nations. A patient, constructive long-term use of its potentialities can bring a real and secure peace to the world. I am certain that such an effort will have the active interest and support of the smaller member states, who have much to contribute in the conciliation of big-power differences and in the development of constructive and mutually advantageous political and economic cooperation.

I therefore venture to suggest certain points for consideration in the formulation of a 20-year United Nations peace program. Certain of these points call for urgent action. Others are of a long-range nature, requiring continued effort over the next 20 years. I shall not discuss the problems of the peace settlements for Austria, Germany, and Japan—because the founders of the United Nations indicated that the peace settlements should be made separately from the United Nations. But I believe that the progress of a United Nations peace program such as is here suggested will help to bring these settlements far closer to attainment.

1. Inauguration of periodic meetings of the Security Council, attended by Foreign Ministers, or heads or other members of gov-

ernments, as provided by the United Nations Charter and the rules of procedure, together with further development and use of other United Nations machinery for negotiation, mediation, and conciliation of international disputes.

The periodic meetings of the Security Council provided for in article 28 of the Charter have never been held. Such periodic meetings should be held semiannually, beginning with one in 1950. In my opinion, they should be used for a general review at a high level of outstanding issues in the United Nations, particularly those that divide the great powers. They should not be expected to produce great decisions every time; they should be used for consultation—much of it in private—for efforts to gain ground toward agreement on questions at issue, to clear up misunderstandings, to prepare for new initiatives that may improve the chances for definitive agreement at later meetings. They should be held away from headquarters, as a general rule, in Geneva, the capitals of the permanent members, and in other regions of the world.

Further development of the resources of the United Nations for mediation and conciliation should be undertaken, including reestablishment of the regular practice of private consultations by the representatives of the five great powers, and a renewed effort to secure agreement by all the great powers on limitations on the use of the veto power in the pacific settlement procedures of the Security Council.

2. A new attempt to make progress toward establishing an international control system for atomic energy that will be effective in preventing its use for war and promoting its use for peaceful purposes.

We cannot hope for any quick or easy solution of this most difficult problem of atomic-energy control. The only way to find out what is possible is to resume negotiation in line with the directive of the General Assembly last fall "to explore all possible avenues and examine all concrete suggestions with a view to determining what might lead to an agreement." Various suggestions for finding a basis for a fresh approach have been put forward. One possibility would be for the Security Council to instruct the Secretary-General to call a conference of scientists whose discussions might provide a reservoir of new ideas on the control of weapons of mass destruction and the promotion of peaceful uses of atomic energy that could thereafter be explored in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. Or it may be that an interim agreement could be worked out that would at least be some improvement on the present situation of an unlimited atomic-arms race, even though it did not afford full security. There are other possibilities for providing the basis for a new start; every possibility should be explored.

3. A new approach to the problem of bringing the armaments race under control, not only in the field of atomic weapons but in other weapons of mass destruction and in conventional armaments.

Here is another area where it is necessary to reactivate negotiation and to make new efforts at finding some area of common ground. It must be recognized that up to now there has been virtually a complete failure here and that the immediate prospects seem poor indeed. Clearly, disarmament requires an atmosphere of confidence in which political disputes are brought nearer to solution. But it is also true that any progress at all toward agreement on the regulation of armaments of any kind would help to reduce cold-war tensions and thus assist in the adjustment of political disputes. Negotiation on this problem should not be deferred until the other great political problems are solved, but should go hand in hand with any effort to reach political settlements.

4. A renewal of serious efforts to reach agreement on the armed forces to be made available under the Charter to the Security Council for the enforcement of its decisions.

A new approach should be made toward resolving existing differences on the size, location, and composition of the forces to be pledged to the Security Council under article 43 of the Charter. Basic political difficulties which may delay a final solution should not be permitted to stand in the way of some sort of an interim accord for a small force sufficient to prevent or stop localized outbreaks threatening international peace. The mere existence of such a force would greatly enhance the ability of the Security Council to bring about peaceful settlements in most of the cases which are likely to come before it.

5. Acceptance and application of the principle that it is wise and right to proceed as rapidly as possible toward universality of membership.

Fourteen nations are now awaiting admission to the United Nations. In the interests of the people of these countries and of the United Nations, I believe they should all be admitted, as well as other countries which will attain their independence in the future. It should be made clear that Germany and Japan would also be admitted as soon as the peace treaties have been completed.

6. A sound and active program of technical assistance for economic development and encouragement of broad-scale capital investment, using all appropriate private, governmental, and intergovernmental resources.

A technical assistance program is in its beginnings, assisted by the strong support of the President of the United States. Its fundamental purpose is to enable the people of the underdeveloped countries to raise their standard of living peacefully by specific and practicable measures. It should be a continuing and expanding program for the next 20 years and beyond, carried forward with the cooperation of all member governments, largely through the United Nations and the specialized agencies, with mutual beneficial programs planned and executed on a basis of equality rather than on a basis of charity. Through this means the opportunities can be opened up for capital investment on a large and expanding scale. Here lies one of our best hopes for combating the dangers and costs of the cold war.

7. More vigorous use by all member governments of the specialized agencies of the United Nations to promote, in the words of this Charter, "higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress."

The great potentialities of the specialized agencies to participate in a long-range program aimed at drastically reducing the economic and social causes of war can be realized by more active support from all governments, including the membership of the Soviet Union in some or all of the agencies to which it does not now belong. The expansion of world trade which is vital to any long-range effort for world betterment requires the early ratification of the Charter of the International Trade Organization.

8. Vigorous and continued development of the work of the United Nations for wider observance and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms throughout the world.

It is becoming evident that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly in 1948 without a dissenting vote, is destined to become one of the great documents of history. The United Nations is now engaged on a program that will extend over the next 20 years—and beyond—to secure the extension and wider observance of the political, economic, and social rights there set down. Its success needs the active support of all governments.

9. Use of the United Nations to promote, by peaceful means instead of by force, the advancement of dependent, colonial, or semi-

colonial peoples, toward a place of equality in the world.

The great changes which have been taking place since the end of the war among the peoples of Asia and Africa must be kept within peaceful bounds by using the universal framework of the United Nations. The old relationships will have to be replaced with new ones of equality and fraternity. The United Nations is the instrument capable of bringing such a transition to pass without violent upheavals and with the best prospect of bringing long-run economic and political benefits to all nations of the world.

10. Active and systematic use of all the powers of the Charter and all the machinery of the United Nations to speed up the development of international law toward an eventual enforceable world law for a universal world society.

These three last points deal with programs already under way to carry out important principles of the United Nations Charter. They respond to basic human desires and aspirations and coordinated efforts by all governments to further these programs are indispensable to the eventual peaceful stabilization of international relations. There are many specific steps which need to be taken; for example, under point 10, ratification of the Genocide Convention, greater use of the International Court of Justice, and systematic development and codification of international law. More important is that governments should give high priority in their national policies to the continued support and development of these ideals which are at the foundation of all striving of the peoples for a better world.

What is here suggested is only an outline of preliminary proposals for a program; much more development will be needed. It is self-evident that every step mentioned, every proposal made, will require careful and detailed, even laborious preparation, negotiation, and administration. It is equally self-evident that the necessary measure of agreement will be hard to realize most of the time, and even impossible some of the time. Yet the world can never accept the thesis of despair—the thesis of irrevocable and irreconcilable conflict.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under order heretofore entered, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is recognized.

THE AMERASIA CASE—JAMES FORRESTAL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield that I may ask unanimous consent to make a statement which will not take more than 1 minute?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object, I am not going to object in this instance, but I shall object to any speeches being made in the Senator's time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California that he be allowed to speak for 1 minute in the time of the Senator from Washington, without the Senator from Washington losing his right to the floor?

The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the name of the late James Forrestal has been brought into the Amerasia case as one who may have suggested a delay in making the arrests. Mr. Forrestal is not here to state his reasons for such action, if, indeed, he ever made such a suggestion. But while he cannot speak for himself, there is a diary in the custody

of the White House that can speak for Mr. Forrestal. If he suggested such a delay in prosecution during wartime, he must have believed Soviet espionage was involved, because if such was not the case, certainly no foreign government could have been interested in what a relatively inconsequential American magazine might have been involved in at that time. The diary may show the reason for any action he took and with whom the matter was discussed.

Mr. President, in fairness to Mr. James Forrestal, who had a long record of patriotic devotion to the Government of the United States which included service as both Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of National Defense, I believe the committee which is investigating the Amerasia case at this time should subpoena the wartime diary which is now in the custody of the White House.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall make a unanimous-consent request with respect to the pending measure in the Senator's time, if he will permit me to do so.

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the pending measure and all amendments thereto not later than 5 o'clock Monday next, the time on Monday to be controlled by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], with no amendments to be offered which are not germane to the issue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether it is the intention of the majority leader to hold a session tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. If I can get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at any time on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday, which is agreeable to the Republican side of the aisle, we shall not hold a session tomorrow.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I would not make any objection if the agreement were made for Wednesday. I shall object if the unanimous-consent request is made for Monday.

Mr. LUCAS. I should be glad to comply with the request of the Senator from Utah, and make it for Wednesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that at 5 o'clock on Wednesday next, the Senate proceed to vote on the pending bill and all amendments thereto, that the time on Wednesday be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill, to be controlled by the Senator from Washington and the Senator from South Carolina, and that all amendments be germane to the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from Washington would not be inclined to agree to the unanimous-consent request which has been offered by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Illinois. However, I would suggest to the majority leader, if he cared to endeavor to secure a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on my intended motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency on Monday at 5 o'clock, it would be agreeable to the junior Senator from Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois modify his request to that extent?

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Washington will further yield, may I inquire if he could include a vote on all amendments and the bill itself, in the event the motion to recommit should fail? I should think that we should like to conclude the entire matter at that time, including the motion to recommit, all amendments to the bill, and the bill itself.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington would be less than frank if he did not say that, along with other Senators of like mind, he would like to cross one hurdle at a time. From the point of view of the junior Senator from Washington at least it is his intention to have a vote on a motion to recommit as of a given time. He has suggested a particular time. One reason I am offering my view on the subject is that the majority leader was quoted in the press this morning, in a very agreeable way, as saying that he was not satisfied that there were a sufficient number who shared his view in support of the proposed legislation to pass it. The Senator from Washington is likewise deeply in doubt as to how the issue will be resolved. He can think of no better way of testing his position than to have a vote to recommit on Monday.

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

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield first to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Would the Senator be willing to agree to vote on Monday at 5 o'clock on the motion to recommit, and if the motion to recommit should fail that we vote on Tuesday, say, at 3 o'clock on the bill and all amendments thereto?

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

Mr. CAIN. May I first answer the question of the majority leader? There are obviously a good many uncertainties in this situation. The Senate has been told that the House intends to take no action on a bill extending rent control until the Senate has taken action. I am not constrained to take that to be continuing fact. Therefore, it is my position that first we should vote on the question of recommitment, then decide our future action. Consequently, I would not be inclined, sir, as an individual Senator, to agree to any unanimous consent request beyond that of voting on a motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I appreciate very much the compromising spirit of the Senator from Washington to accomplish what I think is virtually a vote on the bill. I feel that a motion to recommit would largely determine what would happen to the bill. I am quite satisfied that if that could be done we would have taken a long step toward getting a final vote on the measure. I want to thank the Senator from Washington for offering to comply with most of the requirements of the majority leader's request. I humbly suggest to the majority leader that if a vote on the motion to recommit were taken there would be no difficulty in determining the final outcome of the bill.

Tuesday is not a very favorable day to vote on the bill in its entirety, if I may so suggest to the majority leader. If the bill should be recommitted, of course there would be no need for a further agreement. If it were not, Tuesday would not be so acceptable as Wednesday so far as this side of the aisle is concerned, although I want to say to the majority leader that there is no disposition on this side of the aisle to delay a vote on the bill longer than is actually necessary to debate it in its entirety. I feel that if a vote were taken on Monday on a motion to recommit, the result would largely decide the outcome of the bill.

I hope the majority leader will accept the proposal. Wednesday is Flag Day, and several Senators have accepted invitations to speak on that day. I am ready to vote on it at any time.

Mr. CAIN. It would be too bad if we could not vote on something on Wednesday, which I understand is a day set aside for dedication to things patriotic. I think the subject before us could adequately be dealt with under such auspices.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. The statement of my friend from Nebraska with respect to my agreeing to the suggestion made by the Senator from Washington is one that I do not believe I could accept. The Senator from Nebraska says that he and those for whom he speaks are not trying to delay a vote on this bill. Certainly, if the Senator from Illinois is willing to agree to a vote on Monday at 5 o'clock on a motion to recommit, if then we cannot get an agreement to vote on the measure on a day certain, it seems to me that someone is trying to delay action on rent-control legislation.

In a conversation I have had with the leaders on the Republican side of the aisle, at which time I gave the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Ohio, and other Senators a sort of a chart which we hoped we might be able to agree on, as to how long it would take to dispose of certain vital measures which it is necessary to consider before Congress can adjourn, I suggested that we could dispose of the rent control bill in 3 days. The Senator from Nebraska said we could dispose of it probably in 2 days. I was very happy when he made that sugges-

tion, because I thought perhaps 2 days would be sufficient for the debate.

Mr. President, we have practically concluded the debate on this side of the aisle so far as rent control is concerned, and surely we are going to get a vote upon rent control some time during this session of Congress. I take it that some day, sometime, we are going to get a vote on rent control, and it seems to me that the Senate is pretty well briefed upon the pros and cons of the situation. I plead with the Senators on the other side of the aisle, if they are interested in expediting the business of the Senate, if they are interested in having Congress get away by July 31, to agree to the proposition which has been submitted.

I am willing to vote on Monday, so far as recommitment is concerned, but I am not willing to vote on that question alone, and leave the rent-control bill wide open for another 3 or 4 days of debate. I do not feel I can do that and expect to expedite the business of the Senate, as everyone apparently wants to have done.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington would like to say that he likewise wishes to expedite the business of the Senate insofar as he can help in doing it, and with reference to the particular matter before the Senate, he wants to dispose of it.

It seemed to the junior Senator from Washington that he was doing a reasonable thing in suggesting that, so far as he individually was concerned, he would be pleased to have this matter tested at 5 o'clock Monday afternoon next. But it likewise is his determination to know more about where he stands as a result of that intended vote on Monday afternoon next, and the majority leader is on very sound ground in asking what wishes for the future may be entertained by the junior Senator from Washington or any other Senator on either side of the aisle following that vote.

I was endeavoring to be reasonable in my approach, and if the majority leader thinks my position has not been quite reasonable, I believe he should credit it to the determination and good intentions, sincerely and conscientiously arrived at, of one Member of the United States Senate, who, because he feels so deeply as he does, is simply not inclined to take more than one obstacle at a time.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. Once more I should like to restate the desire of the Republican side of the aisle to cooperate with the majority leader in disposing of legislation. It is true that when the program was submitted by the distinguished majority leader, certain days were set down for various measures which he, in his judgment, felt would afford sufficient time to enable the two sides to agree upon a program to be completed by a certain date, and if that proposal were agreed upon, then the time agreed to would be allotted to the various measures.

I appreciate the fact that I stated that I felt two solid days of debate, if we got

that kind of an agreement, might afford sufficient time to handle the rent-control bill. That is only a matter of judgment. That is only the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska, because there has been no agreement yet to consider that program. Once we have agreed upon a program, then there will be no argument.

Of course, the rent-control bill is the measure at present under consideration. Following that will be the social-security bill. My estimate of the time necessary to consider that might differ from that of the majority leader. The debate which will ensue will depend on the importance of the bills taken up. Certainly, if an agreement is made that so many days be allotted, when that agreement is made, it will be kept, but until such an agreement is made, the time that even one Senator thinks is sufficient is a question for him to decide.

I again say to the majority leader that I feel if we could enter into the unanimous-consent agreement as suggested by the Senator from Washington we would clear a big hurdle toward a final vote on the rent-control bill. I really believe that, because certainly if the bill is recommitted, there will be no need for a further vote. If it is not recommitted, then, of course, a question will arise of trying to get another unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Nebraska why the Republican side objects to fixing a particular time for a vote. I do not care what date they may fix; they can make it Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday. But let them suggest a date. That is what we would like to have.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. CAIN. Just a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, but the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. CAIN. I would answer it from one point of view, that at least one Member of this body, who happens to sit on this side, is no more willing to agree at this moment to a time when the bill will be voted on, if the intended motion to recommit fails, than a good many Senators on the other side of the aisle were willing to agree to a day and a time and an hour on which to vote on the late FEPC bill. The situation is as clear as it could possibly be, under the definite conviction of one individual Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to yield for a moment?

Mr. CAIN. Yes, unless the majority leader desires to speak.

Mr. LUCAS. There is only one other statement I should like to make in the time of the Senator from Washington.

We offered the Republican side of the aisle the privilege of picking any time they desired to vote on a rent-control bill. That is about all we can do. Otherwise, we shall have to continue the debate interminably, until we finally reach a decision.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not care to detain the Senate long, but I desire to make

it clear that the Republican side is not holding up a vote on anything. Any Member of the Senate has a right to object to a unanimous-consent request to vote on any measure. All I have to do is to refer back to the basing-point bill, in connection with which one Senator on the other side of the aisle held up for months and months and months a request for unanimous consent. I could go back through the experience of the Senate for months and years and prove my point.

On this side we have adopted no policy on the rent-control bill. The Senate debated the measure on Wednesday, the calendar was called on Thursday, and now we are starting the debate on Friday, and the majority leader says that if we do not agree to a vote on a certain day the Republican side is to blame.

Let us get the record clear. If the pending measure is so important as the majority leader says it is, the debate should continue until those who are interested complete their arguments. At the moment I know of five Senators who desire to make speeches. Certainly, they have a right to make them, and if, for obvious reasons, some do not want to vote at one time or another they have a right to object to a unanimous-consent request, no matter which side of the aisle it comes from.

Mr. President, I make this statement constructively. I do not want to hurt the program in any way, and if the majority leader will take the advice of the junior Senator from Nebraska—just once—I say that if he will ask for a vote on the motion to recommit on Monday, he will expedite the work of the Senate, because, in my humble opinion, that will be a test vote upon the measure. The debate might be over Monday without any doubt. If it is not, I say to the majority leader that I shall strive, as I always have, to expedite the completion of the proposed legislation after sufficient debate has been had by whatever Senators desire to take part in the debate, no matter on which side of the aisle they may sit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair inquires, What is the unanimous-consent request now pending?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, unless the majority leader has officially offered one, there is not one pending that I know of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois offered a unanimous-consent request originally, to which various modifications have been suggested, but the Chair does not recall that his original request was objected to specifically.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the majority leader is going to insist on the original unanimous-consent request, I shall be compelled to object.

Mr. LUCAS. I modify the request so as to make the time 5 o'clock on Tuesday of next week for the vote on the bill, the motion to recommit, and all amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to that request?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, insofar as the motion to recommit is concerned, I would be perfectly willing to vote on that question at

5 o'clock on Monday afternoon; but to any other unanimous-consent request I could not agree. I therefore must object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I modify my request and ask that the Senate vote on Wednesday at 5 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has modified his request by asking unanimous consent that at 5 o'clock on Wednesday the Senate proceed to vote on the bill and all amendments, and a motion to recommit. Is there objection?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will advance exactly the same reasons again with respect to that request. I am absolutely of the opinion that we should do one thing at a time. I must object.

Mr. LUCAS. I modify my request, and ask that the vote be taken on Thursday of next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CAIN. I object.

Mr. LUCAS. I modify my request to make it a week from Monday, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that at 5 o'clock on Monday week the Senate proceed to vote on the bill and all amendments germane to the bill, and a motion to recommit.

Mr. CAIN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. LUCAS. Could I get an agreement to vote next Christmas?

Mr. WHERRY. O Mr. President—

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, indeed the majority leader could. If he wants to make such a request it will be agreed to without exception by the junior Senator from Washington, and supported by many Americans.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All this procedure is by unanimous consent. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to any Senator?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield, if I may, to either of the Senate leaders. First I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly the remark made by the majority leader asking that a unanimous-consent agreement be entered into to vote next Christmas. That is not expediting the work of the United States Senate at all. That is simply prolonging a controversy that is not conducive to bring about a meeting of minds at all. If there is sincerity, and Senators really want to work out a unanimous-consent agreement, the thing for the majority leader to do is to take a step at a time. If he will ask for a vote on the question to recommit on Monday, there is a chance that we can work out a unanimous-consent agreement. But it cannot be done by trying to drive Senators into accepting the majority leader's own terms, without some effort being made to work out a compromise. Certainly the situation will not be helped by sug-

gesting that we agree to vote next Christmas. That will not bring about an agreement on anything.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator will not agree, even to voting next Christmas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield to my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I was about to make the rather facetious remark that we probably could secure unanimous consent to vote after July 1.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to be permitted to propound a question to the majority leader, without the Senator from Washington losing the floor thereby.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none.

Mr. IVES. I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader if he plans to have a session tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New York is correct.

Mr. IVES. Then the Senator from New York asks unanimous consent to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make one further observation in the time of the Senator from Washington. As I understand, there was a press story from Chicago late this morning—I have not seen it—that there would not be any rent-control legislation passed this year, and that I had made a statement to that effect. I serve notice, Mr. President, that we are going to vote upon a rent-control bill in the United States Senate if we have to stay here until next Christmas.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

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

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the majority leader's intention now, in view of the statement he just made, that there will be a night session tonight, and that the Senate will meet tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. I made that statement yesterday for the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. I know the Senator did.

Mr. LUCAS. And the Senator from Illinois proposes to go through with the night session tonight, and with a Saturday session.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that we shall have an all-night session tonight?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not mean that we shall have an all-night session, to be perfectly frank. We shall probably stay here until 10 or 11 o'clock. So long as Senators want to talk about rent control the Senator from Illinois will stay with them. If they want to continue to talk into the morning the Senator from Illinois will stay with them.

Mr. WHERRY. And there will be a session on Saturday?

Mr. LUCAS. And there will be a session tomorrow. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Perhaps it would be proper, in the face of all this uncertainty, to suggest to the majority leader and other interested Senators—and I am certain they are all interested—that, having failed to agree to set a date and time to vote on an intended motion to recommend the bill, that motion might, under those circumstances, be made by the junior Senator from Washington at any time. Presently he thinks he would not give further consideration to offering such a motion until, let us say, about 5 or 6 o'clock this afternoon. But I do not think it would be proper to overlook the possibility that because the Senator from Washington and other Senators want to expedite this matter and find out more clearly where they stand, such a motion later in the day or early evening would most properly be in order.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate until next Monday.

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

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, during the first several years when I was a Member of this very distinguished body. I was more moved on many occasions by the comments and prayers of the late Peter Marshall, then the Chaplain of the United States Senate, than by all the words, put together, of all the others whom I hold in such high regard. As I was listening to and taking part in the brief colloquy which has recently occurred between the majority leader, the minority leader, and other leaders, I was reminded that on my desk I had a book of Peter Marshall's prayers. At the outset, I wish to read one of them, to provide me, individually, with some encouragement and some faith, and because what Peter Marshall said several years ago was of prime interest then to every Senator and every American, and obviously continues to be so.

On a day, almost 3 years ago, in the month of June, Peter Marshall stood beside the President of the Senate and said, in simple language and simple tones, as were always employed by him:

Teach us, our Father, how to look at the things we see, and to look at them without bias or prejudice. We may not know how much of our troubles are caused by refusing to look at the facts or by viewing them so differently.

We are all too familiar with "dirty looks," "scornful looks," "unbelieving looks," "black looks." Give to us discerning and understanding looks. With the truth waiting to be looked at, discovered, and applied, forgive us when we refuse to look at it or to welcome it. If Thou wilt help us to cast

the mote of prejudice and pride out of our eyes, then shall we see clearly.

We pray for good sight and good sense, in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

Mr. President, when I began to offer my arguments in opposition to Senate bill 3181 on Wednesday of this week, I said, as I recall, that I intended, along with other Senators, to speak at considerable length on this question, but always to speak to the question. When this matter has been resolved, I do not wish to be charged with having tried merely to obstruct or delay the passage of the proposed legislation by talking about things and circumstances not related to the main question.

However, Mr. President, I think there is a legitimate exception to be made to that position, which I established on last Wednesday, if I am not mistaken, and I hope to make such an exception about once an hour, for it will take only 1 or 2 minutes at such periods to do so. At those times I shall probably offer other words, given to us in the United States Senate by a great man, a distinguished American, a very deep thinking churchman, the late and very lamented Peter Marshall.

Mr. President, before offering additional arguments against Senate bill 3181, the Federal rent-control-extension bill, which is the unfinished business, I wish to establish my intentions and to state the several fundamental reasons why I and other Senators, and certainly millions of Americans, believe it will be bad public policy for the Senate of the United States to pass Senate bill 3181.

My intentions for the several days immediately ahead are now somewhat different than they were on Wednesday, 2 days ago, when Senate bill 3181 became the unfinished business. It had been my intention on Wednesday to seek help from other Senators in delaying a vote in the Senate on Senate bill 3181, until the House of Representatives had taken action on a companion measure. The House Rules Committee publicly announced several weeks ago that the House would begin to consider and to take action on its companion Federal rent-control bill on next Monday, June 12. That announcement was made available to the country and to every Member of the Congress, including, obviously, the majority and minority leaders.

On Wednesday, I was of the opinion that it was unnecessary and unwise for the Senate to consider Senate bill 3181, on which the Senate Banking and Currency Committee had held no thorough hearings of any kind—a charge I made on Wednesday, and a charge which has not been successfully refuted by anyone. I held that opinion inasmuch as the House of Representatives was prepared to take action beginning next Monday on a companion bill, which had been thoroughly studied by the House Banking and Currency Committee, and on which thorough and adequate hearings had been held.

In the hearings the appropriate House committee, when the question of whether Federal rent controls should be continued or extended was before it, requested opinions from American citizens.

However, the counterpart committee in the United States Senate thought it proper to vote to report a companion bill on which it had not requested advice or counsel or information or facts or data from American citizens, whom all of us sit in this body to represent as best we can.

During the course of the Senate proceedings on Wednesday afternoon, the majority leader announced that he had conferred with the House majority leader and that they had agreed that the House would take no action on a Federal rent-control extension measure until the Senate had taken whatever action it thought proper. With the knowledge of that change of plan by the administration, my original intention on Wednesday became automatically and rapidly outmoded.

I should say, parenthetically, that I learned a great deal about parliamentary procedure in a very great hurry on Wednesday. When I came to the Senate that morning—and, Mr. President, one can get a few chuckles out of life—it was on the assumption that I was prepared to resist the motion to consider the rent-control extension bill. I had not even had a chance to take my seat, it seems, as I now view the matter from hindsight, when not only the motion to consider the bill had been disposed of, but the bill itself was before the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield, if unanimous consent is given for that purpose, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor, in order that I may request unanimous consent for leave of absence?

Mr. CAIN. Yes, if the acting majority leader does not resist that request. If he does not, I will agree to it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will not resist a request for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate until the beginning of the session of the Senate on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, what I learned on Wednesday about parliamentary procedure I shall not forget. I have no criticism of any person or of any method which was employed to bring Senate bill 3181 before the Senate.

It is the responsibility of every Senator to understand every rule which governs our conduct in the Senate. I am one among the first to admit that I did not know that such a rule as the one which had brought this bill, like a gust of wind, before us, existed. I shall never be unmindful of its existence in the future, for it may turn out to be very helpful to this Senator to employ it at some unforeseen time to come.

The present intention of the junior Senator from Washington can only be that of resisting the passage of S. 3181 for as long as he can. I am not prepared, of course, to state how much time will be consumed, because I do not yet know how many other Senators will speak against S. 3181, nor have I any way of prejudging my own strength and endurance.

The junior Senator from Washington will be guided by two main reasons for opposing any further extension of Federal rent controls.

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington came to this Chamber today in a very good mood. He intends to keep himself in that mood. In order to do that, he will endeavor to introduce certain light spots in the course of the afternoon. But, throughout the afternoon, he will be deadly serious, too; and for the next minute or so, I want to be as serious as I think I possibly could be on any question, at any time, past, present, or future.

The first reason is that any extension of Federal rent controls will completely deny a great hope which was expressed by the President of the United States on a former occasion. The President is my President, by the way; he is our President; and, for so long as he sits in his office on Pennsylvania Avenue, he will be the President of everyone in this country. In a message which he delivered before a joint session of the Congress, and to all the American people, early in 1949, the President expressed a great hope. In that address, he said:

Every segment of our population and every individual has the right to expect from his Government a fair deal.

Federal rent controls have violated the rights belonging to a segment of our population. Federal controls have abused and often destroyed the rights which belong to American individuals.

When the President made this comment, which was to give rise to a great and understandable hope, I take it that I and every other American who could think and was conscious of the expression of that hope—which means about 150,000,000 of us—applauded what the President said. I applauded the Presidential comment about fairness. That is all he was talking about. I think I understand, as do many of my colleagues, and those who occupy the galleries, what fairness means. The Senator from Washington will continue to fight to make fair play and fairness available to all Americans, not merely to some Americans. With the President's fair-play declaration as my text, I shall continue as best I know how to keep Senate bill 3181, the Federal rent-control extension bill, or anything like it, from becoming the law of the land in this year of 1950.

The second reason which justifies my continuing opposition to S. 3181 is that there no longer prevails a national emergency to justify the continuance of rent controls after June 1950. I trust that everyone who endeavors to be fair in his judgment on the question now before the Senate, including Senators themselves, will always remember the emphasis which is placed on the word "Federal." In my judgment, there no longer prevails a national emergency to justify the continuance of Federal rent controls. While admitting that the time on Wednesday was largely occupied by the junior Senator from Washington, I may say that no other Senator on either side of the aisle rose to try to maintain and prove that there is today a national emergency covering the entire United States, an emergency sufficiently strong

to justify the continuance of Federal intervention in the rights of the individual human beings who populate this land.

It is not for me conclusively to maintain as a Member of the Congress that a need for continuing rent controls does not exist in certain areas or communities of America. That is a question which must and ought to be resolved in those places where the problem appears to prevail. City councils and State legislatures are much better qualified at this time to determine the need for doing away with rent controls or extending them, than we of the Congress will ever be. The question before the Senate and before the Congress is whether an emergency, justifying Federal intervention and Federal procedures, still exists. I deny emphatically that any such national emergency prevails today. To my mind, the record is all I need for the support of my conviction.

Since the act was passed in April 1949 large areas throughout the Nation have been removed from Federal rent controls. Nine great and sovereign American States have been eliminated from the system of Federal rent control during the past 15 months.

I suppose any thoughtful person would understand that the word "national" embraces 48 States. When nine of those sovereign States are removed from a national problem, do Senators or other Americans generally believe that there is any longer a national problem, after a large segment has been removed? Americans, and particularly Senators, may very well agree that a problem continues to exist in areas which have not been removed from Federal rent controls, but by no stretch of the imagination can it be maintained that a national problem exists when 9 of the 48 States, as of this moment, are doing business in their own way, and as they wish to do it.

I wonder how many individuals are conscious of the names of these States? I hold them in very high regard. They are nine great areas of this country in which this question of what to do about rent controls was considered, digested; thought about, and action taken. One of the States of which I can think decided there ought to be a continuance of rent control on a local level. I refer to the State of New York. But at least its legislature stood up in the year 1950 to say, "Shame on us if we are unwilling to do for ourselves what certain other States are still continuing to ask a big, power-grasping Federal Government to do for them."

One of these States is Texas. One would expect Texas to want to be relieved of rent control at the earliest convenient moment. Many fine and splendid things may be said about the State of Texas, not the least of which is that every Texan I have ever known is never very anxious to let someone else carry his shoes or do his work for him.

There is a very interesting story about something which actually happened in Texas. I have all the details here somewhere, which I can relate later on, if it shall seem appropriate. But the State legislature decided to pass a decontrol law. Congress gave the American States

last year, for the first time since rent control was inaugurated, the right to be free men and women again if the States wanted to assume that glorious privilege. The State Legislature of Texas had a go at the question, and it voted overwhelmingly, I take it, to get rid of Federal rent control, and the Governor had pen poised in hand to sign the bill when what happened?

A very interesting fellow, his only drawback being that he wants all of us, from whatever State we represent, to go on paying his salary in perpetuity, the Housing Expediter, Mr. Tighe Woods, by name, from Washington, D. C., decided that he knew more about what Texans ought to do for Texas than did the Texans themselves. So he trotted off on June 10, approximately a year ago, to Austin, as the United Press story tells us, to have a joust with the Governor of Texas in order to convince the Governor and the State legislature, consisting of good, upright American citizens, that they did not know enough to come in out of the rain. Fortunately, he did not get away with it, but it is an indication of the days and the times in which we live.

Fifteen years ago, if a Federal autocratic bureaucrat went to any American municipality or State to direct its judgment, there would then have been pride enough on the part of the local communities to have thrown him out, and there never would have been passed by Congress such laws as would have resulted in a swarm of locusts throughout the country directing the thinking of society on the lower levels.

The United Press story tells us this, and I think it should be in the Record:

Tighe Woods, National Housing Expediter, today told Governor Jester that he believed Texas' Rent Decontrol Act was illegal and urged that the Governor veto the bill.

Mr. President, I am not concerned with a man whose name is Tighe Woods; I am concerned with the responsibility of the office he holds permitting him to do such a fantastic thing. I read further:

Woods flew to this capital city from Washington for an unannounced conference with the State's chief executive.

It had to be unannounced, because Mr. Tighe Woods is no dummy; he is a man with some perception. He knew that if he announced his intention to go to the Governor's office, to try to get the Governor to upset an act of the State legislature, his summary removal from that area might have turned out to be violent in its characteristics. So he went unannounced, as a sleuth in the night. I read further:

Woods conferred with the Governor for about 45 minutes.

There is another compliment which we can pay to Texas. Despite the fact that the Governor knew that this Federal agent should not be there, in the first place, the Governor was a courteous, considerate, and humane man, so he took 45 minutes that belonged to the citizens of the State of Texas and gave it, without any charge, to a bureaucrat, who, from a vacuum in Washington, D. C., thought himself better qualified

to know about Texas than did the Governor and the legislature of that State.

When the conference was over, Mr. Woods said that Jester gave him no definite answer as to his contemplated action. I read further:

"He told me," Woods said, "that he intended to give the matter very careful thought and consideration."

However, Woods added that the Governor seemed very much impressed when the Housing Expediter told him that about 76 percent of applications for rent increases by landlords were being granted.

The rent increases, he said, averaged about 22 percent.

Woods flew to Austin from Washington.

There is one thing that can be said about our friends who represent Federal agencies. They travel first class. They do not go by covered wagon anymore, or by taxi or by jitney, and they seldom bother to go by train unless they are a little bit frightened about the uncertainty of things "upstairs." They go by the finest, fastest means of accommodation; and because of the millions of dollars which we place at the disposal of Federal agencies generally for travel-expense purposes, it would be unnatural to assume that we would not see them in every American community on every possible occasion.

The newspaper article goes on to say:

He said he would return to Washington immediately.

He went to Austin unannounced, and he wanted to leave unannounced. His comments to the press were just on the fly as he was on his way to the airport, I suppose. I have known him a long time. Let us not forget that he is the Housing Expediter, and he wants to go on being the Housing Expediter and continue his travels back and forth across the land. I know him to be at times a very frank man. Sometimes it happens that he is not unfrank; he just does not talk. He was very frank with the press after his visit with the Governor of Texas. After he had told the press the Governor was impressed, he said:

I don't know whether I achieved anything or not.

I wonder what he was trying to get, other than something to which he was not entitled.

In 1949, when the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was chairman of the Subcommittee on Rents and Housing and I was a member of that committee with him, and enjoyed serving on it with him for 3 years in a row, and we both served under the supervision and jurisdiction of the present occupant of the Chair, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and we were privileged and proud to do so, the committee, almost in its entirety, was determined to recognize that a State in the year 1949 had some rights. It was a member of that committee, a southerner, a Democrat from the State of Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who stood on the floor and offered and secured the adoption of an amendment which the Housing Expediter had resisted, to permit a State to decontrol itself by legislative action and by signature of the

Governor if the State thought it should do so.

I think almost every Senator voted in support of that very American and very reasonable amendment. It was shocking to think that there had been years in this country following the war when a sovereign State was not permitted to determine how to manage the rights of private property. Yet, in the face of that declaration and purpose to restore some dignity to the men and women and officials of American States, there was the Housing Expediter, to whom, in this instance, I shall not refer by name because there is nothing personal about it at all, going at the taxpayers' expense, riding in an airplane, to tell the Governor of a great State that what his legislature had done should not have been done.

Some persons have the temerity to wonder why Senators speak at length. I think they should be conscious of the fact that there are many questions upon which men and women feel very deeply. If I had the strength, as I have the ambition, if it should take a month to develop this proposition so as to make absolutely and totally impossible a recurrence of such shenanigans as that of the Housing Expediter endeavoring to impose upon the Governor and the free people of the State of Texas, I could keep on talking for that length of time.

The Housing Expediter merely added among other subjects he discussed with the Governor of the State of Texas that he, Mr. Woods, was "particularly worried about the military establishments" in the State. So the Housing Expediter had a nice time in Texas. I have been following him rather carefully, being somewhat of a student of this question. He has been seen in practically every outpost, big city, small city, in fact any city, where an effort was being made to decontrol. Because we want the RECORD to be complete, a little later we shall indicate how many acts of decontrol were initiated by the Office of the Housing Expediter. Several hundred of them have been. The interesting thing to determine is why he decontrolled on his initiative certain areas while bypassing others which were in greater need of consideration.

Mr. President, Texas is only one of nine States which no longer have rent controls imposed upon them. Perhaps the junior Senator from New York, or one or both Senators from Illinois, or perhaps the majority whip, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] will rise later in the debate to suggest to the Senate that chaos and catastrophic mischief resulted from decontrolling rents in the State of Texas. I do not think they will try so to do because they are reasonable men, they are rational men, and they are intelligent. They can read the record on the basis of the results of decontrol as can the junior Senator from Washington, other Senators, and Americans generally. I use the words "chaos" and "catastrophic" because they are generally encountered or included in any press interview which is given, for example, by the Housing Expediter.

Several weeks ago he was in Atlanta, Ga., a city which still has rent control. He wanted to reassure the citizens of that city. He said, "If you are thinking of decontrolling your city, let me warn you that chaos will result." Because he was in the State of Georgia and because the people there did not know whether he was right, he could successfully maintain that chaos had resulted in areas far removed from Georgia. As a matter of fact, Mr. Thomas, of my staff, has just handed me a reference to the last public announcement which the Housing Expediter made in Atlanta, Ga. It goes like this:

Tighe E. Woods predicted that Federal rent control will be extended for another year, because wholesale decontrol at this time would result in a serious strain on the Nation's economy.

That was on the front page of the Atlanta Constitution. That was a statement which I suppose the Housing Expediter thought would reassure the good citizens of Atlanta, Ga. Probably he overlooked the fact that those citizens, so far as I know from history, are frightened by nothing. Their forebears were part and parcel of and fought in the War Between the States. The residents of the State of Georgia, including the citizens of Atlanta, do not frighten very easily. It is a monstrous thing that in 1950 the Housing Expediter should give vent to such a public announcement. The article goes on to say:

Rent controls are scheduled to expire on June 30 unless Congress extends them.

Mr. President, he picks his spots very well, because the Atlanta Journal and the Atlanta Constitution have a wide circulation, and he knows that what he says in Atlanta will be made known to the country. Woods said to the citizens of Atlanta:

Sudden decontrol could cause very chaotic conditions, especially in large cities where there are tight housing conditions. The housing official, in Atlanta on a tour of the country—

He has a right to tour the country. We should not criticize him for that, because each year we pass appropriations to provide him with first-class travel to go anywhere he wants to go. If there is to be any criticism of the Housing Expediter's traveling around the country, the criticism should be directed to the Congress of the United States, which places at his disposal first-class transportation.

The Housing official, in Atlanta on a tour of the country for a first-hand look at the housing situation, said rents rose as much as 150 percent in some cities following decontrol.

I would say parenthetically and not very quietly that any public official who makes any such unsupported statement ought to be impeached, if we have the machinery with which to do it, or ought to be fired on the basis of incompetence, or actually ought to be sent to an American penitentiary for endeavoring to incite Americans to riot and confusion. The highest housing official in the field of Federal rent controls says that chaotic conditions will prevail and exist because

rents in some cities rose as much as 150 percent following decontrol.

Which cities was he referring to? Where are the cities? By way of argument, if the rents rose 150 percent, what were the reasons for their so doing? I do not have the names of the cities immediately at my disposal, but the Housing Expediter was not talking about Knoxville, Tenn. He was not talking about Spokane, Wash. He was not talking about Dallas or Houston or Amarillo, Tex. He was not talking about Phoenix or Tucson, Ariz. He was not speaking of Salt Lake City. These are but a handful of the many cities ranging in population from 100,000 to 900,000 in which rents on the general average have risen from 6 to 16 percent as a result of doing away with Federal rent controls. The Housing Expediter has the unmitigated gall as one American to say to a great many other Americans, "In heaven's name, do not permit your area to be decontrolled, because in some cities unnamed"—and the record shows that he could not name them—"rents have risen as much as 150 percent."

Mr. President, there are other States which have been decontrolled. What about the State of Nebraska? Someone came before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I think it was either the Housing Expediter or a witness testifying in support of continuing rent controls, who said that the State of Nebraska was having a very bad economic time, and tenants were suffering because of the rapid and violent and heavy increases in rents since the State had been decontrolled.

On the basis of the record, I ask—because we are going to be debating this question for some time, and I want my colleagues to read the RECORD—which Senators, if any, out of the 96, have heard bad things, which could be supported, as a result of rents being decontrolled in the State of Nebraska? If we are talking economics, as I hope we are, though I have not had much reason to believe that was what was intended when this bill was brought up, when we say bad things are going to happen, and have happened, we had better prove it.

When I heard that story on the part of some witness I took the trouble to call on the telephone several friends of mine in Nebraska. I conferred with both the Senators from Nebraska, told them what the charge had been, and asked them to get any supporting data they had, because we knew this matter was to be debated in the Senate of the United States. Nothing of any injurious and substantial character has happened to the citizens, free men and women as they ought to be, in the sovereign State of Nebraska, as a result of decontrol. The reverse has been true.

The State of Wisconsin has its own rent-control law, with the nature of which I am not personally thoroughly familiar, but that State was removed from Federal domination. It passed a more liberal or less restrictive law, and all the comments I have received from citizens of Wisconsin concerning the results have been favorable.

The State of Utah has been decontrolled, as has the State of Arizona. I

have deeply enjoyed the privilege of being in some of the larger cities of Arizona, such as Phoenix and Tucson, both of which have been decontrolled for some time. Prior to the time when they were decontrolled the Office of the Housing Expediter said, "Chaos can be anticipated. Tenants will be piled 10 deep in the streets of those overcrowded, congested cities." But it did not happen that way, and everything I am saying today is in support of the contention that the good things which have happened in provable instances in, for example, the State of Utah—and I now see present one of its distinguished representatives in the Senate, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]—can be anticipated and will happen in cities and States yet to be decontrolled.

Oh, we hear talk about liberalism in this enlightened twentieth century, in 1950. I suggested on Wednesday, when this debate, which is important, at least to my mind, began, that the very outstanding and distinguished liberal public figures in the United States Senate who were advancing arguments in order to support the continuance of Federal rent control, were in that instance not being liberal, but were being reactionary, from the top of their heads to the bottom of their feet.

No man alive can call himself a liberal who is frightened of what will happen in the field of economics and natural laws when cities not yet freed of Federal rent control domination are decontrolled in the future. A modern-day liberal who fears the future and its consequences, when he knows that similar situations have brought only good when other cities were decontrolled, obviously is not a liberal. What he or she might be I do not know.

Mr. President, let us take the State of Alabama. I served for 3 years on the Committee on Banking and Currency with a gentleman I like and respect. He is an outstanding Democrat, a man of considerable influence, and, even more, of perception and intelligence. I refer to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. He has been for rent control during the time I have been a Member of the Congress. We have had many arguments about it. We argued pleasantly and sincerely. But as a result of the law which the junior Senator from Alabama, among others, supported last year, which permitted States to decontrol themselves, his own sovereign State of Alabama took advantage of the opportunity, and there are no controls in that area.

Birmingham, Ala., is a big place, not so large as some other cities, but it certainly is congested. It is an industrial city. It has all the ingredients within it from which a Housing Expediter can hazard a guess of the catastrophic and chaotic things to come.

The Senator from Alabama has not yet had an opportunity to offer his views on the question before the Senate. The Senator from Washington hopes to have an opportunity to listen to his views, because they will come from a man who thinks carefully about what he wants to say. The Senator from Alabama, now being conscious that the State of Ala-

bama has gotten rid of the yoke of Federal intervention, may think there is something more to be said about permitting other States to do what Alabama, fortunately, to my mind, has done for the good of its citizenry.

The State of Virginia is to be decontrolled in this month of June, and I think the date of decontrol was to be today. The Virginians who serve in the State legislature and the Governor of the State of Virginia, were not frightened of things they had reason to think were not going to come to pass. They looked over their shoulder for a good and adequate reason. They looked backward so that they could determine what had happened under comparable circumstances in other areas of America, so that they could look forward and give some real assurance to their free citizens concerning what the results would be of reestablishing private property under competent procedures. If that is not an American undertaking, again I say, I know not what it is.

The State of New York decided, through legislative action, and because there was a considerable uncertainty over what the Federal Congress was going to do, to pass and activate rent control. They took that action I think on the 1st day of June. Perhaps the junior Senator from Washington thinks it was not a wise thing for the State of New York to have done, but that is beside the question. As a Federal legislator, I say it is none of this Senator's business what the State of New York, through its legislature and Governor, thinks is best for the interests of most of its citizens.

The prime point this afternoon is that the State of New York said, to paraphrase the action taken by the Legislature of the State of New York, "We think the problem involving rent controls is not over. We think that New York City, as well as many of our up-State cities, is going to have to continue under control for quite some time." But the State of New York did what several other States have so far successfully dodged. The State of New York assumed a responsibility. The State of New York, through its Governor and legislature, said, "If seven or eight American States have been decontrolled or have passed their own rent-control laws, that means there is no longer a national question involved in this problem, and if we in New York think rent controls are proper for the future, the first thing we ought to do is to provide for them ourselves." So they passed a rent-control law. They imposed continuing rent controls on their citizens. But when an American citizen resident in New York wants relief, where does he go? He does not call up an agent of the Federal Housing Expediter. He goes to a local representative of a State and local government. I think New York under those circumstances is to be congratulated for having faced up to what every State in the Nation was advised to face up to 15 months ago.

Then lastly among the States that have been decontrolled is the State of Mississippi. I know the Senators from Mississippi rather well. Both of them are very distinguished Democrats. Both

of them are even more distinguished Americans. I have worked on one Senate committee with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and I see quite a good deal of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I do not remember that either of those Senators said to me, "Senator, we are thinking about decontrolling rents in the State of Mississippi, and we are scared to death. We think the people will be running around in the streets because they cannot find a place to live." JOHN STENNIS and JIM EASTLAND have better sense. They can read the record, as can any other reasonably intelligent American.

Aside from these nine States, Mr. President, that have either been decontrolled entirely or entirely removed from Federal jurisdiction, as I understand, there are three other equally great and sovereign States which have approved stand-by rent-control laws, which can become operative when the Federal rent law expires on June 30 of this year, if these three States then wish to control rents within their respective boundaries. These States are Connecticut, Maryland, and New Jersey.

I have no idea or any way of knowing what these three States will do if the present Federal rent-control law is permitted to expire on the intended termination date of June 30. But what I do know—and it is good to have a chance to say it, particularly in the presence of the present occupant of the Chair, the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is that the States of New Jersey, Connecticut, and Maryland are now prepared, by virtue of their own determination and their own acknowledgment of a responsibility and an obligation, to do whatever they think ought to be done when the Federal Government has been eliminated from further imposing upon their rights, restrictions which in peacetime can never be justified, let alone their being justified in this year of 1950, 5 years after a war which was waged, we thought, to do something about preserving and maintaining and stimulating freedom for human beings everywhere.

As I stated so often on Wednesday, the Illinois Legislature will meet—or will it? The Illinois State Legislature is scheduled to meet in special session beginning on June 19 to consider the advisability of adopting a State rent-control law. As of the minute, and without any intention or desire to be disrespectful, the State of Illinois, it seems to me, is dissimilar to the States of Connecticut, Maryland, and New Jersey in this respect; the three States last mentioned got ready in ample time so that they could take care of any situation which arose. The State of Illinois, for reasons unknown to me, took as an assumption—though the Congress officially, to my mind, advised them otherwise 15 months ago, in April of 1949—that the Federal Government would automatically extend Federal rent controls beyond an agreed-upon termination date of June 30, 1950.

It was only a relatively few days ago, or a couple of weeks ago, that the Governor of Illinois became conscious of something. It seemingly occurred to him that maybe the Federal Government

would not extend rent controls because maybe a majority of both Democrats and Republicans would agree that there was no longer any justification for the Federal Government managing the private property rights and affairs of free citizens. The Governor of Illinois then, for the reason that he is a rational and reasonable man, called a special session to meet on June 19 to consider the rent-control situation.

I suggested on Wednesday that one of the reasons the pending bill had been brought so rapidly to this floor was the hope that it would be passed immediately—expressions of that character were made—and sent to the House in order that a continuing Federal rent-control law would be approved before June 19, so that the special call of the Illinois State Legislature could be canceled. Personally the Senator from Washington does not want to see that happen. He is doing what little he can to see that that sort of a practice is not indulged in. He wants the State of Illinois and every other American State to do whatever it thinks it wants to do, but not bear in mind that Congress is going to do for any State in 1950 what that State ought, should, and must do for itself.

I do not care to labor this point about the State of Illinois very much, but there are certain characteristics about it which must be redefined from time to time, and never forgotten. The Legislature of the State of Illinois, I think, in its session of 1947, approved a rent stand-by control law. That law was designed and considered to take the place of the Federal rent law if and when the Federal Government ceased to exercise the management of private property. The law, I am told, continued on the books of the State of Illinois for a 2-year period, expiring without argument or without struggle without consideration on June 30, 1949. That law was permitted to expire after a time when the Congress of the United States had said, through its many Members, or through many Members of both bodies, "It is no longer the intention of the Congress of the United States to extend Federal rent control beyond June 30, 1950." In the face of that, for reasons unknown to me, and it is none of my business as a Senator, the law of Illinois was permitted to expire. And now, because the State of Illinois includes within its splendid confines probably the second largest city in population in the United States, Congress, with that as one of the major reasons, is being asked to continue federalizing property because a sovereign State has in months gone by seen fit, from my point of view, to disregard its own responsibility.

In addition to the fact that the State of Illinois is to have a special session of its legislature on the 19th of this month, we should also bear in mind, when we are thinking about the consequences of the future, that the State Legislatures of Massachusetts, South Carolina, and Louisiana are presently in session; and, obviously, each of those legislative bodies can, if it so wishes, pass rent-control measures, should they think it proper to do so. I am mention-

ing the States which are going to have special sessions of their legislatures, or those whose legislatures are in session, or those whose legislatures have already taken action on their State rent-control problem, in an effort to indicate that with all those facts before us, I think it is difficult for anyone to maintain rationally that a national problem involving rent control continues to confront the Nation today.

For example, Mr. President, I know quite a great deal about the city of Chicago. It is a big city. I have some figures respecting it, and I wish to submit them for the RECORD later today. It would be my own view, although, admittedly, I do not live in Chicago, that more rental accommodations at reasonable prices would shortly be made available there without rent control than with rent control. However, again that is not the main point.

If we are talking about the need for continuing rent control in the city of Chicago, although I might dissent as to the need for rent control there, and might say that rent control is not necessary there, yet I would not vote on that question. Certain men and women are qualified to do that on their own responsibility, inasmuch as they live in that State. I think the same thing is quite true for any other State or city in the country.

One of the three largest cities in the State of Washington, which I represent, along with my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, has been decontrolled for some months; and the people are delighted. The tenants and the property owners have restored a feeling of mutual respect for each other. In consequence of decontrol, business is considerably better for more people than it was before. The experience of a typical American community—in that instance, a community of about 150,000 men, women, and children—has been good in all respects. Within 30 days or 6 weeks, I have forgotten just which, after decontrol, 1,200 additional rental units came on the market. Competition set in again. People were better able to find the rental accommodations they wanted at prices they could reasonably afford to pay.

My own home city of Tacoma compares very closely with the city of Spokane. Spokane is the heart and the capital, so to speak, of the Inland Empire, located in the great wheat and grain, apple and fruit section. Tacoma is on the other side of the mountains, and has a population of about 150,000. It is a seaport. It depends for its living on diversified industries of one kind or another. Shipping comes to it or flows from it, or used to, at any rate, to all corners of the world; and we hope that excellence of maritime activities will be restored.

The point is that the city of Tacoma has not decontrolled itself. Those managing its affairs have thought there was some reason to believe that a housing shortage continued to exist and that they would be better off under rent controls, rather than not, despite the fact that their sister city, right across the

mountains, has benefited everyone in and out of that city, and all through the State, by decontrol.

The city of Seattle, the largest city in the State of Washington, has now, I think, a population in excess of 500,000. It continues to be under rent control. Although again, from my point of view, both those cities would be immeasurably better off if they were not under rent control either by a Federal authority or by a State or local authority, yet, with reference to the future, I think the State legislature and the cities, such as Tacoma and Seattle, must make up their own minds, and ought to be given that opportunity.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry, if it is understood that he may do so without losing the floor? Will the Senator yield for that purpose if I obtain unanimous consent that the Senator will not thereby lose the floor?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be most pleased to do so. I only wish to make clear—I ask the Senator to permit me to make this observation—that I play by the rules of the game. I have no desire to be put in the position of stalling this matter. However, if any time a Senator wishes, for a length of time which may be agreed to by the majority leader, to proceed in the way the Senator from Michigan has indicated, obviously I shall have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENRICKSON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan that the Senator from Washington may yield for the purpose stated? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the measure now before the Senate is the rent-control bill, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to know whether there has been made, and is at the desk, a motion to recommit the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No such motion has yet been made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me, for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it the intention of the Senator from Washington to submit to the Senate a motion to recommit this bill?

Mr. CAIN. It is.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. At what time does the Senator from Washington anticipate that such a motion will be made and/or voted upon?

Mr. CAIN. Earlier today, this morning, I suggested to the majority leader that I would like to make such a motion, to be voted on at 5 o'clock on Monday afternoon. The majority leader did not agree with that request. So there is presently no time fixed on which to vote on such a motion.

However, I did say about an hour ago, before the majority leader left the Chamber, that before this day is over I might, to test the situation, to find out more clearly what Senators are thinking

about in regard to this problem, offer such a motion to recommit the bill, and might do so about 5 or 6 o'clock. However, I have given no serious consideration to a definite time at which to offer such a motion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator from Washington expect a vote to be had this afternoon or this evening on his motion to recommit?

Mr. CAIN. I can only say—and I shall try to come to an agreement with the Senator from Michigan—that I had suggested to the majority leader that I merely wanted to tell him that I might feel constrained to offer such a motion later today; and I was of that mind for the reason that the majority leader, who holds one view, and the Senator from Washington, who holds another view, both are in doubt concerning how many Senators feel regarding this question, because the question came before the Senate most summarily and practically spontaneously on Wednesday; and the Senator from Washington, the Senator from South Carolina, and one or two other Senators are the only Senators who have expressed opinions regarding the matter, one way or another.

I was of the opinion, and I think the majority leader was, likewise, that the best way to determine how Senators felt was to offer and to vote on a motion to recommit.

If I could, I would tell the Senator from Michigan exactly when I would offer such a motion. However, at the moment I have given it no serious consideration, and I simply do not know.

Mr. President, I think I understand what the Senator from Michigan wants to know, namely, certain information which is not presently available. But, because the Senator from Washington, as well as nearly every other Senator, hopes to accommodate any reasonable requests which are made by our colleagues, I should be perfectly willing to try again to accomplish what I was most willing to agree to earlier today, and to present a unanimous consent request that the motion to recommit which is intended to be made by the Senator from Washington be voted on, if not at 5 o'clock on Monday, at some other hour of that day.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield further to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator at this time make such a request, to see whether we can fix an hour on Monday for voting upon a motion to recommit?

Mr. CAIN. If I may ask, was the Senator from Michigan present during the colloquy earlier today?

Mr. FERGUSON. I was not. I was in the Appropriations Committee at the time.

Mr. CAIN. I would volunteer this suggestion: Our friend, the minority leader, was here this morning, and, if the Senator from Michigan would like to confer with him, he can ascertain from the Senator from Nebraska exactly what the situation was this morning. Following that, if the Senator from Mich-

igan then thinks it would serve a useful purpose for the Senator from Washington to renew the unanimous consent request, he would be pleased to do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan should now propose—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, aside from wanting to advise Senators and others as to the States which have been decontrolled within the past 15 months, as to the States which have passed their own stand-by rent-control laws, and as to the States which presently are either in legislative session or whose legislatures are about to be called into session, I think it well to present certain figures as to the total number of rent-controlled units which have been removed from Federal supervision and domination since April 1949. Rental units which were under Federal control as of April 1949, numbered 14,072,246. Since that date, and until June 30, 1950, a few weeks hence, the number of units under Federal rent control will be approximately 7,070,000. This means that within 15 months more than 50 percent of the units under Federal rent control will have been removed from Federal control and domination. With these facts in mind, I wonder how any individual in his sane mind can contend that today there exists a national emergency which justifies the continuance of Federal rent procedures and controls.

Are not all of us conscious of the fact that when the 1949 rent-control bill was being considered by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and during the debate in the Senate on the recommended bill, it was stated on innumerable occasions by many Senators that they were serving notice on the Nation that Federal rent controls would expire entirely on June 30, 1950? I was among those who urged the States of the Union to prepare, and if they thought it necessary to do so, to design and approve their own State rent-control laws.

To my mind, it is nothing less than utter and complete nonsense for any individual, in or outside the United States Senate, representing any State or community, to say now that he was not given proper and due notice of the intended ending of Federal rent controls on June 30, 1950. On the 10th day of January, for example, the junior Senator from Washington sent a telegram to the Governor of New York, a copy of which was read into the Record by me on the same date. That was five long months ago. From that telegram I now quote briefly:

Those in the Congress who feel as I do want no State or community to say in coming months that they have not been informed that Federal rent controls would expire on the last day of June. The time is long overdue when New York State and every other State in the Union ought to be completely accountable to their citizens for the fundamental and important issues involved in the management of their property rights question. I would urge you and your legislature to do what you think is right for New York State without any further dead-hand

control by the Federal Government. If there are isolated communities in America which can establish a proven need for continuing rent controls, those communities or their parent States must be charged with a full responsibility for managing their own affairs. Those for whom I speak will use every conceivable legitimate means, including whatever time is required, to prevent the Federal Government from any longer mismanaging and interfering with the property rights of American citizens throughout the Nation.

Five months ago a Member of the United States Senate, the junior Senator from Washington, advised the Governor and Legislature of the State of New York of the situation. The junior Senator from Washington is but one of many Senators who, months before that on the floor of the Senate, advised the States of the Union, that if they wanted rent controls in the future they must secure them through action taken by the most responsible body in each State—the legislature.

In June 1950, if we can but get the proponents of this measure to rise and say so publicly, they will contend that the Congress must continue Federal rent controls because States throughout the Union have not had a chance to design and approve measures to take the place of the Federal rent controls, which are scheduled to expire on the 30th of June.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if the junior Senator from Washington needs any defense or excuse for speaking at length on the pending bill, the telegram to which I have just referred is all the justification I need.

In January of this year I said what I meant and meant what I said. It is a good thing, in passing, to use a phrase which a distinguished, but absent and very much missed Member of the Senate, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has used with such telling effect on other occasions in the past. Mr. President, if I needed any additional defense or excuse for doing my best to defeat the pending bill, I think I have it. This justification is that the junior Senator from Washington, as a free American citizen, who happens, by the way, to be a tenant, paying a very substantial rent in the Nation's Capital—all I can afford to pay, anyway; I am not a landlord or property owner—will not nor does he dare to be party to a proposal which every totalitarian thinker or ruler has imposed upon citizens from the beginning of history. How, Mr. President, can one vote, for example, for an Atlantic Pact, for military arms shipments to Europe or anywhere else throughout the world, or for a continuing Marshall plan, while at the same time voting for a Federal rent-control bill which violates the rights of some citizens and confiscates the property of other citizens?

Since the war's end we in America have taken a calculated risk with money and property belonging to everyone. We of the Congress do not always stop and ask how we shall spend the money, but what we spend is always the money of the citizens, and not our own. Since the war's end we have taken a calculated risk against bankrupting our great Nation so that we might contain and stop or hinder communism at its source all over the world. We do this in the name of simple

freedom and of preserving the human and property rights of men and women all over the world. That is why we do so much in so many quarters of the world. We seek to give to others the kind of freedom we take for granted and which the Constitution of the United States makes inviolate as to all of us. If these things we do for those who live elsewhere, we can do nothing less for those who live and work in the United States of America.

Mr. President, I do not say, for I do not think it is true, that those who support the pending bill are in themselves any part of Communists or Socialists. Among the proponents of this proposed legislation are admittedly several—not many—who believe in a managed economy with tight Federal controls. They believe that to be right and proper, but otherwise they are good and well-intentioned Americans. What I am saying, Mr. President, is that these men who are neither Socialists nor Communists are encouraging the rest of us to impose restrictions on our free citizenry, as would undeniably be done if our Government were being managed by outright Communists and Socialists. The management of private property is absolutely essential to either of these two methods of doing business, by the Socialists on the one hand and the Communists on the other hand.

In my telegram to Governor Dewey last January I used the words "those for whom I speak." I ought to answer someone's intended question by relating who such persons might be. The pending bill came up so rapidly on Wednesday that there was insufficient time within which to determine accurately the names and the number of Senators who would probably vote against Senate bill 3181. We all know, however, that five members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee voted against reporting the bill and three other members voted conditionally to report it. It is logical to assume that these five negative voters will vote against the pending bill and that some or all of the five may speak against it.

I am particularly hopeful that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] will offer their views on the question. Those two Senators have most sincerely in previous years voted for an extension of Federal rent control. If I am not mistaken, both the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New Hampshire voted for an extension in 1947, 1948, and 1949, while at the same time the Senator from Washington was voting against an extension in those same years. I know the Senate will appreciate having their views concerning why they now think it is time for an end of Federal management of private property. Both the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont used to say that the sooner we can do it the better. They said, "We know that Federal rent controls are bad for the moral structure of this country; we think they are defensible for economic reasons, and we hope that the reasons for extending the law will very shortly cease to exist." Since it has been thought

that the time to get rid of something which is bad has come, the Senator from Washington hopes that those who feel that way will feel constrained to speak to the question.

I look into the RECORD of March 9, 1950, because on that date the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] had a few brief comments to make on the floor of the Senate with reference to Federal control, which I thought were picturesque and effective, and I offer them for the consideration of the Senate. The Senator from New Hampshire had this to say:

I fought for rent control as valiantly as I knew how during the war years and post-war years. A year ago on the floor and in committee we served notice on the States in general that the end of rent control was in sight; and some of us were bold enough to say that we would never again vote to continue Federal rent control.

Parenthetically, Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire was, therefore, foremost among Members of the Senate who, in April 1949, said to every American citizen, "Look no longer to your Federal Government for an extension of federalized rent controls, because your Congress will resist any attempted extension."

The Senator from New Hampshire said he was one of that number who said they would never again vote for a Federal rent control bill. He went on to say:

I hope the action of the Senate on Federal rent control will be akin to the advice given by a famous fellow, "Embalm, bury, cremate, and freeze—take no chances."

The Senator from Washington mentioned on Wednesday that on March 9 of this year 28 Senators voted against an amendment which the junior Senator from Washington had offered to provide the Housing Expediter with a deficiency appropriation in the sum of \$1,400,000, rather than \$3,600,000, which the Housing Expediter had requested. It seems reasonable to assume that some or all of those Senators will speak and vote against S. 3181. Mr. President, both Democrats and Republicans are to be found among these 28 Senators. By name, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day they were: BREWSTER, BRICKER, BRIDGES, BYRD, DONNELLY, DWORSHAK, EASTLAND, ECTON, ELLENDER, FERGUSON, FREAR, GEORGE, GURNEY, HICKENLOOPER, KEM, KNOWLAND, MCCLELLAN, MUNDT, O'CONOR, ROBERTSON, STENNIS, THYE, TYDINGS, WATKINS, WHERRY, WILEY, WILLIAMS, YOUNG.

I think there is good reason to assume that a number of Senators whose States have been decontrolled or removed from supervision by the Federal Government will vote and speak against S. 3181. I do not know why a Senator from a State which has been decontrolled should hastily vote to extend Federal controls on some other States. If one knew for certain that all 28 Senators who voted against the deficiency appropriation for the Housing Expediter on March 9, the 5 Senators who voted against S. 3181 in committee, and all the Senators whose States have benefited so greatly from being decontrolled would vote against S. 3181, if and when a vote is taken, we would know for certain that the meas-

ure would be conclusively defeated. I do not know for certain how any Senator intends to vote on S. 3181. The record of past performance and attitude simply indicates to me how a large number of Senators could very well and very easily vote against the pending bill.

I think it is time we should begin to be advised how different Senators intend to vote. Since yesterday, Mr. President, I have been approached by several Senators who inquired concerning the amount of time I intended to take, and what I thought the final result of the debate would be. I provided them with substantially the same information which I just offered to the Senate. One Senator on my side of the aisle asked whether I would agree to a unanimous consent agreement to vote in the near future. I inquired of him why he thought the junior Senator from Washington ought to agree to any such request. He replied by saying that almost every Senator knew how he was going to vote—and I think he is going to vote for the bill—and that we ought to vote soon on the question in order that there might be some possibility of the Congress adjourning in late July. However, the Senator agreed with me that the Senator from Washington was absolutely right in his contention that the Senate leadership should not have brought Senate 3181 to the floor at this time, and that the attempt was being made because of a fear that the House of Representatives might defeat a companion bill, if the House, as had been intended and generally agreed to by both Democrats and Republicans, took action first. In spite of that, the Senator who spoke to me, while agreeing with my contention, thought the Senator from Washington ought to agree to a request to vote soon on the pending bill. I could not disagree more strongly with this attitude. I see no point in dropping a cause worth fighting for merely to be agreeable, if it comes down to that, or because I am as anxious as the next person to have Congress adjourn and go home.

There are few Senators in this body who have so many justifiable reasons for wanting to go home. The weather in the Nation's Capital, Washington, D. C., is extraordinarily dissimilar to the weather and climatic conditions in the State of Washington. The humid atmosphere in which we live is something through which we gladly suffer because of the pleasure derived from our work. However, the weather of this Capital City is avoided by those who come from the Pacific Northwest as quickly as it is convenient to do so. I know very few Senators who can anticipate such a happy, congenial, and pleasant atmosphere to live in as is represented by my home State. Like every other Senator, as soon as the public's business has been disposed of, I want to go back where I came from.

The Senator to whom I have just referred thought that the junior Senator from Washington might alienate the affections of other Senators by continuing to speak at length. I ought to say a little something about such an observation, and say it very plainly. The fight of the junior Senator from Washington

in this instance is for fair play and for freedom. In this fight I actually represent, along with others in Congress who share my views, millions of Americans who do not have access to this public forum. Every once in a while we ought to stop and reflect on the fact that there are about 150,000,000 Americans, of whom only 96 have a right to speak from the floor of the United States Senate. It is therefore no light responsibility or burden one assumes in representing millions of others who are not provided with an opportunity to speak for themselves on a question which has so much to do with their right and opportunity for happiness and fair play in the future.

Mr. President, if the choice ever had to be made by the junior Senator from Washington—and I hope the time never comes—between those whom he represents throughout the United States of America and those who would lose their affection for him because he kept them from doing something else in which they might have more interest, the choice would be both clear and ridiculously easy to make. Although the Senator from Washington is known as a conservative in politics—and this is his position by a deliberate and hard-headed choice—he is for the rights of the people of any party and any faith who can neither speak nor defend themselves on the floor of the United States Senate.

In the last couple of days, Mr. President, I have heard from thousands of just such American citizens. Until they have been given an opportunity to speak through the Senator from Washington and through other Senators who want to assist in this undertaking, there will be no possible likelihood of an agreement to a curtailment of debate.

To show other Senators exactly what the Senator from Washington means and how he feels, he will read a handful of telegrams. They are signed by men and women of whom I have never heard and whom I have never seen. These telegrams have been sent to me from different sections of the Nation. They ask for relief and for help. The junior Senator from Washington will help those who sent the telegrams get relief if he can. Every man has his limitations in strength and ability and energy. The Senator from Washington will live up to the potential of what characteristics he has in those directions.

I would draw the attention of those who care to listen—and I hope other Senators will bother to read these telegrams in the Record tomorrow—that they have come from the ordinary men and women of America.

From Omaha, Nebr., is one signed by Mr. Paul F. Rapp, 111 South Forty-ninth Avenue. He says:

The decontrol of rents in Nebraska has not caused hardship and it is felt that we should not pay for the cost of administration elsewhere, where it is also not needed.

Another telegram comes from Omaha, Nebr., signed by Mr. O. J. Harman, 1020 South Thirty-first Street. I am glad the senders put their addresses on these tele-

grams, because it probably means that they are responsible individuals, and would be glad to have anyone check the authenticity of their residences and of their right to send the telegrams.

A great many of these telegrams—and they have not been hand-picked for that reason—necessarily refer to the Senator from Washington in complimentary terms. This is quite natural, because the senders and I share similar views. Under normal circumstances one never reads telegrams which come to him in his office, but feeling impelled to read these, I wish to thank all those who sent them for their consideration and their best wishes.

Mr. Harman says:

We need more men like you with courage of their convictions. Nebraska has already settled this question to the satisfaction of most tenants and owners.

I think that is a very reasonable telegram. This man is not looking for the millennium. He says most people have been satisfied as a result of the decontrol of rents. When he suggests that I have the courage of my convictions, that is one item on which I can, I think in a reasonable way, agree.

Another telegram from Nebraska is signed by John Evahn. There are four from Nebraska in a row. Mr. Evahn says:

Nebraska has experienced no hardship from decontrol. We are opposed to paying cost of control over other States.

Mr. Alfred C. Kennedy wires:

All power to you in a righteous fight to end rent control. Why should Nebraskans pay cost of control in New York and other large cities? Rental conditions here stabilized without any serious difficulty.

Another advantage of putting these telegrams into the Record is that the Office of the Housing Expediter can read them. If the Housing Expediter thinks that serious difficulties have been encountered in Nebraska as a result of rent being decontrolled, let him, through some other Senator, start to say so, beginning, let us say, tomorrow.

Those who send these telegrams live where they live. The Housing Expediter can venture a guess, living thousands of miles from where some of these people actually live, as to what the conditions surrounding such persons actually are.

From Akron, Ohio, comes a very short telegram, from Charlotte Klose. She says:

Keep fighting. We want freedom.

Here is a telegram from Denver, Colo., a long one, signed by Mr. E. M. Thomas. It reads:

If Congress insists upon continuing rent controls, why not demand that they provide there is an adequate Government bonus to landlords who cannot make a profit from their present rentals? Thus the tenant who cannot pay a high rental but is established on the landlord's property through an arbitrary Government decree could continue his occupancy at the frozen rental price and the Government would make up the loss to the landlord.

Parenthetically, is that such a bad idea, if we are going to have control, to have the Federal Government in the field of managing private property?

Mr. Thomas proceeds:

This is just as he does for the farmer and other groups. The landlord's taxes help pay the farmer bonuses. He, the property owner, also buys the farmer's products. His tax money is also used to pay Government subsidies to Government housing projects which compete with his frozen rents.

Parenthetically again, it is good once in a while to let Americans offer us some common sense. Up to date in this telegram this man has not missed the boat. He is merely saying to the Federal Government and to the Congress that if it is proper to subsidize one group in order to maintain high prices, it ought also to be proper to subsidize the property owner in order to keep rents low. That is just the ABC, not only of economics, but of fairness.

The telegram continues:

The landlord's expense costs of labor and living have risen the same as have those of his tenants. Low-cost rental housing will never commence until investment therein can yield a profit. Tenants complain their quarters lack repairs. This proves the landlord's need of income. He cannot repair property which does not earn enough money to pay such repairs. If there is to be fair deal for the backward nations out of the landlord's taxes, why not just include in the Marshall plan the property owners of the U. S. A.?

Mr. President, I think that is a pretty good telegram.

Here is one from Clayton E. Feltis; but I shall pass that over for the moment.

Here is a telegram from B. F. Catherwood, of Lafayette, Ind. The telegram reads:

Do all you can. The Midwest is with you. Show how much controls have cost and how many people have been employed and how many property owners have had their values confiscated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CAIN. If I am privileged to answer a question, I shall be pleased to yield. Does the Senator wish to propound a question to me, or to the majority leader?

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Washington that he contemplated making a motion to recommit, and also in view of the fact that apparently the Senator from Washington desires to hold the floor at all costs, regardless of a quorum call or any other legislative proposal, I ask the distinguished Senator if I may propound a question to the majority leader.

Mr. CAIN. If I am permitted so to do, I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In order to get from the distinguished Senator from Washington his desire as to when the motion to recommit may be made, and also with the idea in mind that there may be something worked out between the majority leader and the minority leader as to the vote, I am wondering if the majority leader would consent that the

Senator from Washington not lose the floor, and might suggest the absence of a quorum, or make some arrangement for a temporary recess, or whatever he cares to suggest, in order to talk over the situation with the distinguished Senator from Washington, and see what might be worked out.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me without prejudicing his rights thereby?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have discussed this question with the able minority leader; and I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess for a period of 15 minutes, without prejudicing the rights of the Senator from Washington, and that at the end of 15 minutes the Senator from Washington resume the same status he occupies now, so far as the parliamentary situation is concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for offering the opportunity for us to discuss the matter. I appreciate it very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the Senate will now stand in recess for 15 minutes.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess for 15 minutes.

On the expiration of the recess (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate reassembled.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have often been told that the Senate can do whatever it wishes, whenever it agrees to do so. I have just been off the floor of the Senate for a few minutes, learning something about the trade in which we are engaged. As I now understand, for the time being we simply continue with our business.

Mr. President, when I was interrupted, I was reading some telegrams which have been received by me in the course of the past several days, from ordinary, average, typical American citizens throughout the country, who, not being able to speak for themselves—appear to be appreciative—I think they really are—when some Member of this body is anxious and desirous of speaking for them.

From the city of Seattle, Wash., I have a telegram from a John Jarosek, probably a first-generation American. There are many first-generation Americans in the State of Washington, and they are a great people, too. I shall read the entire telegram and those who read the Record will overlook and understand the personal reference. He says:

Admire a fighter. This veteran of two wars believes the small landlord (property owner) should be entrusted with the same rights as belong to other American citizens to make an honest living.

I may say to Mr. Jarosek, 3,000 miles away, "You and the junior Senator from Washington are in complete agreement. I do not know whether this Government of yours is going to permit you, Mr. Jarosek, an honest, decent, fair living in the future, without having your property controlled by the Federal Government, but we will continue to do what we can to help you prevail in your wish."

Here is a telegram from Herbert Pflughaupt, 211 South Lancaster, Dallas, Tex. Texans, I notice, aside from being fighters in their own right, generally send telegrams which are relatively long, apparently believing in paying for whatever they want to do. This gentleman says:

Congratulations for your stand on American freedom versus rent controls. Tyrannic shackling of thrifty property owners forcing poor widows and aged couples to the poorhouse and render their housing improvements impossible. Shame on every conspirator who seeks to continue rent controls and enslave free Americans to black-market operations. Rent decontrol in Dallas shows three and one-half persons per housing unit against three and six-tenths persons in 1940. According to latest census, much better rental housing now than last year and cheaper rates than black market.

HERBERT PFLUGHAUPT.

From my own city of Tacoma, Wash., comes a telegram under date of June 7. The subject of rent control is rather important in that community, where opponents and proponents vigorously present their divergent views. This telegram is signed "Tom Swayze, Forrester Carter Lee, and 10 others." For a good many years, 10 years to be exact, I had a position in Tacoma's city hall, and this gentleman, Tom Swayze, from whom I have heard but once or twice since that time, was the city comptroller. It is good to hear from him now. Because he knows me, he begins, "Nice going, Harry." The telegram continues:

Rent controls have actually long outlived their usefulness in Tacoma. Competition will soon level rents to fair prices if the Government will take controls off.

It is good to know that there are those in Tacoma, a great city which I hold in very high regard, who share the views of one who is privileged beyond measure to speak as a Senator for the State of Washington.

Mr. Paul Santo, of Detroit, Mich., merely telegraphs bluntly:

End rent controls now. Housing shortage is over. Keep filibustering (talking).

That is his view, anyway.

From St. Louis, a Mrs. or Miss—she does not say which—Bessie L. Roberts, of 3500 Hebert Street, says:

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Please continue fight for the forgotten man, the landlord (property owner). Fight for our right to live as free men and women under our Constitution. We are today minority group being exploited for votes.

BESSIE L. ROBERTS.

I think this lady shares a view which is held by a great many Americans.

Frank Snider, Jr., of 5075 Raymond Street, St. Louis, Mo., merely says this:

There are thousands in St. Louis wishing you good luck in your filibuster against rent control.

I should like a little later to say something about the word "filibuster." There have been some rather notable ones in history, and it was good to indulge in a little research on the subject.

From Philadelphia, Pa., a Mr. Walter Short, of 4618 Cedar Avenue, says:

Keep up the good job against rent control. I wish the Lord would give you more power and strength to talk forever against the control. The war is over and no reason at all for Government to socialize the landlords. From a small landlord.

WALTER SHORT.

That telegram probably is from a small landlord. One thing I have noticed during my brief service in the Senate is that a majority of those who support and sponsor a continuation of Federal rent control always refer to the landlord as being "a great big octopus." They point him out as being a person who maliciously is desirous of charging, if he can get it, ever more than the market will bear. The facts in the case are that more than 8,000,000 landlords or property owners having rental accommodations for use, own, manage, and control four units or less. The average American landlord, on the basis of the facts, is one of the smallest of small-business individuals in the country.

All that is necessary, Mr. President, in order to prove that fact is to go into the country, to get away from the fever which comes from the Potomac River, and to remember always where, as a Senator, you came from, and where, as an American citizen, when your days in the Senate are over, you are likely to return. If you will remember that, Mr. President, you will be conscious of the fact that most of the people who own rental property have saved in the course of their thrifty lives in order to accumulate sufficient money with which to make a small investment, out of which, as aged persons, they look forward to maintain themselves on the income, received as the result of their own endeavors and of their own thriftiness.

From San Francisco, Calif., across the Nation, comes a telegram from Mrs. Esther Gootherts. Everyone knows of the Golden Gate leading into that great city. You, Mr. President, have seen it. San Francisco is surrounded by a magnificent countryside. The telegram reads:

DEAR SIR: The small owners of rental property are all behind you, praying for your strength to hold out.

The next telegram is from a Mr. T. B. Hall, of Los Angeles, Calif. Ah, that is really a large city. Los Angeles has been a matter of concern to me as a student of the question of property for a long time, because there is a smaller number of rental units in Los Angeles today than there was 10 years ago—a much smaller number. The answer is as clear as the fact that the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Eron] now occupies the chair and that the junior Senator from Washington occupies the floor of the Senate.

When the landlords in the city of Los Angeles had their rents frozen and restricted in 1941, 1942, or 1943, while their expenses were rising, many of those landlords being reasonable and intelligent

American citizens, did an obvious thing. They converted their facilities, which the law always permitted, into some other use. They took a rental facility and made out of it a commercial facility. They took a rental facility and made out of it a professional facility. They were able, by one means or another, to have the family occupying the rental space move, and then they placed in the facility, not another family in need of shelter, but a doctor, a dentist, or a lawyer.

Against that obvious recitation of only simple facts, it continues to amaze me that some of my colleagues, and a great many citizens on the outside whom I know, wonder why there are fewer rental accommodations in America today than there were 10 years ago. The answer is contained in three words—Federal rent control.

Mr. T. B. Hall, the gentleman to whom I referred as telegraphing me from Los Angeles, says:

More power to you and your courageous fight to kill rent control.

He goes on to add:

It is a slum maker, a hate maker—

I think we can build a good case for that—

turning one class against another, and breeder of statism. It never has made a place to rent, but has taken thousands off the market.

Mr. President, if Senators think the junior Senator from Washington is wrong in these assertions, let them rise now or at any other time and prove him to be wrong, because if the position which I have taken cannot be proved to be wrong, it would be wholly and morally wrong for us to extend Federal rent control. If, in the face of the facts I shall attempt to establish in the hours to come, as I have already, I think, established some facts, Federal rent control is continued, it will be only because we place political selfishness and desire for political gain over and beyond the rights of the very American citizens whom we took an oath to respect, work for, and protect, when we entered upon our official duties as Senators of the United States.

From Sacramento, Esther Blanton sends this telegram:

Thank God for Senators—

She does not say "Senator," because she knows there are more than one—

Thank God for Senators who fight against rent control. Am old but have to work in order to pay indebtedness on rental property and live. Keep fighting and God bless you.

Where, in heaven's name, could Esther Blanton, however old she may be, have an opportunity to speak for herself on this question if it were not through a Member of the Congress of the United States?

I remember glancing at a telegram which I have here which rather amused me. It is signed by Tyler W. Seeley and comes from Culver City, Calif. I am receiving telegrams from all over the United States. This telegram reads:

United Press, June 7, states you threatening filibuster rent control. Go to it, fellow.

You don't know me from Adam's off ox and unfortunately living in California cannot be your constituent. However, I merchandise over \$2,000,000 of your constituent farmers' production each year from the lower Yakima Valley. Being employed by John Kelly, publisher of Walla Walla Union Bulletin to supervise sales of his church-grape-juice operation. Incidentally, so far as I know Kelly owns no rental housing and anything stated herein is my own idea and is not fostered, approved, or disapproved in any way by John Kelly.

I ought to say, parenthetically, that Mr. John Kelly is one of the most distinguished citizens who has ever lived or will ever live in the sovereign State of California. He is a man of considerable influence in his area of the State and throughout the State, as well, and it is because of the influence of Mr. John Kelly that the sender of this telegram wants to dissociate himself from Mr. Kelly's known influence, in order that the junior Senator from Washington will not think that Mr. Seeley has been encouraged to telegraph me because of my known friendship, affection, and respect for John Kelly of Walla Walla, Wash.

The telegram continues:

Rent control is confiscation of minority voters' property. Don't think great Democratic statesmen like TOM CONNALLY and SAM RAYBURN go for rent control in view of Texas repudiation of rent control. Thank God for Texas, and other sound people like present Utah governor who have no truck with this stuff.

Such telegrams as I am reading might be referred to as being Americana. Certainly they come from people who have made America what it is. If they wish to use colloquial English, such as "such stuff," I think it is a good tonic for some of us who are sometimes more concerned with Elizabethan or Shakespearian English of centuries gone by than we are with the common or garden variety of English which can be so properly used by every American.

Mr. Seeley is quite honest, too. He says:

Sure I have an ax to grind, being a small-time landlord myself. Like yourself I chucked nearly 4 years of my life down the drain in the military service. When I returned from the war no housing could be rented, so I had to buy it at an inflated price. No price control would help me here. My house had never been rented before and had no ceiling the fall of 1947. So I rented it on a 3-year lease and moved to a GI set-up to salvage some inflation.

He must be a young man. He talks like a young man, and like a man of sense. He had to move to a GI set-up so he could salvage some inflation which we daily are imposing, to the detriment of the future, on the generation of today. We should be ashamed of ourselves for a number of things we do, not the least of which is the extension of rent control. I read further from the telegram:

In the spring of 1949, 4 years after hostilities had ceased, under our police state set-up this property was placed under rent control by law for the first time. Now here is the pay-off. Four years after the close of hostilities, after rent had been paid 27 months under lease at legal rate of over \$40 per room per month, the rent-control board knocked the rent to \$20 per room per month effective December 13, 1947.

This is an interesting observation.

Four days later, December 17, rent control was eliminated in Los Angeles County on luxury housing which was defined at \$40 per room per month or better. No luck for me, because the rent board said I was 4 days too late. How long, Senator, must we be tramped on? Note wise people say if rent control is lifted rent will go up 25 percent.

He tells some more economic truth.

They will, and so what.

This average citizen of Los Angeles, Calif., throws more light on this subject in this telegram than the advocates of this bill have thus far offered to the Senate of the United States. It is not news to anyone who reads the RECORD or was here that the pending bill was presented by the committee in less than 5 minutes through a mere generality. We shall have more to say about that later.

Wages have gone up over 60 percent since 1939. Wage earners are still gainers, and I am a wage earner. I am supremely disappointed that unusually high caliber persons—

In high public office—

place political expediency above fairness in their proposed votes on rent control as reported by the press. If persons of their intellectual integrity truck to what brings the quick vote, then we might as well go Pendergast quickly because the country is headed for rapid political decay like France, Italy, Kansas City, Maragon, and Vaughan. This has been long-winded. But your filibuster may be likewise.

I should like to know Mr. Seeley. Whatever his ability, whatever his faults and virtues, he speaks like an American. He wants to say something, and he says it.

Now, we go to Lake Charles, La. We go from California down to the other extreme. The telegram is signed by a very brief signature. It is "A. John."

As argument for rent decontrol note that Government loses money through undeclared secret bonuses between tenant and landlord possibly in several million cases which escape income taxes. Decontrol would recover these and also save staggering cost of rent-control administration.

That sheds a different light on the subject, but not a bad one. To my mind, one of the really bad things about rent control has been that it has made thousands of citizens who were previously honest very dishonest, indeed. When the Federal Government imposes upon the people a law which can be considered to be unfair and which thousands of people do not want—such as prohibition—that law will be broken by whatever means may be necessary. In tens of thousands of cases landlords and tenants have gotten into the habit of doing business under the table, because the Government, which they were brought up to respect, has not permitted them in a reasonable way to do business on the table.

Walter C. Strommer, of Minneapolis, Minn., wires as follows:

Small rental property owners have been forced to support tenants too long. Patience and finances exhausted. Kill rent control or cut everything to depression level.

Donald B. Miller, Sr., makes an interesting observation which I have never

heard of before. He telegraphs from St. Paul, Minn., as follows:

For 30 years I have supported and voted for Democrats.

I wish I had his address, because I should like to make the telegram available to both Senators from Minnesota, one of whom is a Democrat and the other is a Republican. If here is a man who is about to change his political persuasion, it will keep one Senator busy trying to keep the gentleman where he has been for 30 years, and give new hope to the other Senator, who might be led to believe that he can get the gentleman's support in whatever election may lie before him in the future.

If you and Republican colleagues can defeat unfair and stifling rent-control bill, I will hereafter be an ardent Republican. Ten voting members of my family feel the same. Best of luck.

I should like to say to Mr. Miller that the record ought to have told him long before this that the question of Federal rent controls is not today and has not been a party issue in America. Rent controls were continued and extended in 1947, 1948, and 1949 because both Republican and Democrats voted for those extensions. They could not otherwise have been extended. I may say to my new acquaintance, Mr. Donald D. Miller, Sr., that some Democrats and some Republicans have voted against—and without any full measure of success—extending rent controls during the past 3 years. My last word to Mr. Miller is that he had better not think in terms of joining the Republican Party on the question of rent controls, because his depth of disappointment, if he made the change for that reason, would be entirely too keen for me to urge imposing it upon him.

H. F. Mitchell, 4212 Queensbury Road, Hyattsville, Md., wires as follows:

Congratulations for fine talk on dropping public disease—rent control.

Another telegram is from Baltimore, Md. It is sent by Ethel B. McKinney, 114 East Twenty-fifth Street, Baltimore. She telegraphs as follows:

Congratulations on your stand on rent controls. Glad a few Americans left.

I want to say to Miss or Mrs. McKinney that I do not look at it that way. I think the Senate of the United States consists of 96 Americans. Among them are often violent, strong, and vehement differences of opinion. The Senator from Washington is one kind of American. The Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, for example, is quite another kind of American on this question. Both of us are Americans. Let Miss or Mrs. McKinney make up her mind as to which type of Americanism she wishes to give a hand to in the future.

From Nashville, Tenn., comes another wire. Perhaps I or my family in years gone by have known Mrs. Letty Sweeney. I received several years of my limited education not far from Nashville. In fact, I was born in that city. She says:

We thank God for you and pray He will give you and your comrades more strength and power.

I suppose she is interested in freedom. John P. Burke, of Des Moines, Iowa, wires:

May God bless you. At last a real man has appeared. If rent control dies now we can still call this America. Let freedom ring.

This business of controlling affairs at home by the dead hand of the Federal Government runs awfully deep in some people. I take it to be reasonably so that those who have sent the telegrams which I have just read have considered the Senator from Washington and certain other Senators to be representing their views. Here is a telegram from Cincinnati, Ohio, which comes from a gentleman whom I should like to know but do not know. Certainly he thinks I do not represent him. Again I say that the function of a Member of the United States Senate is to represent all the Nation under one of the two hats he wears, the other representing the sovereignty and the affairs of his State.

Mr. Harry Mason, who unfortunately does not give me an address, wires from Cincinnati, and I daresay he believes this strongly:

You are a stooge for the real-estate lobby. Time magazine was absolutely right when they called you a phony. The State of Washington owes the Nation an apology for your actions to date. Resign at once—

Thus says Mr. Mason. There is no doubt about that in Mr. Mason's mind. He wants this matter resolved immediately, and apparently he does not even want to give me a chance to vote on the bill when it comes up, let us say, next week, to be decided.

He says:

Resign at once before they kick you out, and join the circus.

I may say to Mr. Mason that I was scheduled to go to Cincinnati tomorrow night and accept an invitation to speak before my party for and on behalf of a great American, ROBERT TAFT. I have been looking forward to that opportunity to be in the company of the Senator from Ohio, and to strike a few blows for the kind of politics in which I believe. Now I am discouraged not only to think that perhaps I shall not have a chance to go for the purpose of being with the Senator from Ohio and some of our mutual friends, but I am really disappointed that I shall not have a chance to be there tomorrow night and to track down Mr. Harry Mason through the city directory. I should like to see him. I should like to know who he is, and where he came from. I should like to tell him the kind of government I believe in, in which, if one does not agree with a Member of the Senate, he may send him a wire and have reason to believe that that wire, however antagonistic, will be made available to the readers of the RECORD.

Mr. M. P. Morrow, from Missoula, Mont., sends a quiet wire:

I congratulate you on your courageous opposition to the rent-control bill and urge you to continue your fight until its ultimate defeat.

My mind tells me again that on the 10th day of January, as a Senator in this body, I telegraphed to the Governor of

New York and stated that I hoped that the State of New York would do what I thought it ought to do in the matter of rent controls, because some of us would use every legitimate means at our disposal to take what we think is an unholy law off the statute books, that is to say, that we were working, and so gave notice, of the ultimate defeat of such restrictive legislation in the peacetime year of 1950, when the war in which we all engaged to preserve freedom was concluded, if unsuccessfully and disappointingly, 5 years ago.

From Des Moines, Iowa, Mary Russell, who signs herself as an attorney at 234 KP Building, merely says:

I appreciate your stand on rent control. Des Moines is no longer a defense area, and we should return to our American way of life. We are behind you 100 percent.

I think I am answering rather accurately as to whom I think the junior Senator from Washington and perhaps only a handful of other Senators actually represent when I say we are representing a way of life and a spirit to do what we can to prevent its being diminished, or destroyed, or eliminated from the American scene.

Ed Stroup, of Des Moines, Iowa, 1131 Ninth Street, says:

Just heard of your stand to keep up from having this unjust rent law continued. Congratulations. Keep up the good work.

Here is a telegram that causes one a little more enjoyment. Perhaps I know this gentleman; I do not think I do. It is from Clayton E. Feltis, 1119 East Forty-third Street, in the city of Seattle. His reference to a filibuster is simply this:

A good filibuster is just what the doctor ordered. Here's hoping the coffee and chocolate bars hold out until July 1. Our heartfelt thanks.

The next time I am in Seattle, because Mr. Feltis gave me an address, I am going to see him and ask him if he ever tried any part of a conscientious filibuster. I shall tell him that if he has not had that unusual experience he should not wire me exactly in this vein in the future until he has tried it himself.

Here is a telegram which I like. I do not know exactly what the gentleman means by his sign-off. It is "J. H. Rice et al." I do not know to whom the "et al." refers, but the telegram is from Brighton, Mass. I like to get telegrams from Massachusetts, because the Massachusetts Legislature is now in session, taking a look at what they ought to do for the future, and we in the Congress ought to insist that they do it, and not turn to us as a vassal would turn to his overlord.

Good heavens, Mr. President, many of us worry about the future when the only concern we should have is that too many Americans, for reasons which I cannot personally understand, are forever permitting others to do for them what God charged them with doing for themselves. Mr. Rice says:

You have the sincere respect, admiration, and support of tens of thousands of property owners in your fight against the injustices of rent control.

I think Mr. Rice probably means exactly what he says.

Here is a telegram from Earl F. Rebman, 112 West King Street, Lancaster, Pa. Every time I see an address on a telegram I want to read the telegram into the RECORD, because I think the Senators from the States which are the homes of the gentlemen and ladies who telegraph me will be interested in knowing them as constituents in the future, if they do not at the present time. Mr. Rebman says:

I wish you success in your campaign to strike the shackles off of rental home building. Our Nation operating under the free competitive enterprise system—

This, Mr. President, I think strikes a good note:

Our Nation operating under the free competitive enterprise system that fed and defended and offers to lead the world should not have to justify that system. Put controls on the controllers. Bring an end to this un-American discriminatory law.

From New Bern, N. C., comes a telegram signed by H. Bryan Duffy, W. S. Gaskins, Jr., and Mrs. E. H. Jordan:

Heartiest support and congratulations on your stand against rent control.

Here is one from Kansas City, Kans.:

We heartily endorse your fight against the un-American unfair rent law. Keep it up.

CLIFTON J. GUSTMAN.
VESTA WESTFALL GUSTMAN.

These telegrams do not indicate that the senders are playing both sides against the middle. They think the law ought to be done away with, and they do not care who knows it. In fact, they want everyone to know it. I do not know what their politics are, and I could not care less. But I know I am in agreement with what they are talking about.

Mr. H. B. Bechtold, 3519 Hamilton Street, Philadelphia, Pa., telegraphs feeling but briefly and adds a new note:

You are a God-send to the displaced landlords. Keep up the good work.

Now, my mind tells me that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who was famous among the advocates of recently passed displaced-persons law—it is now the law of the land—knows that there must be a considerable amount of talk about displaced persons in Philadelphia and all over Pennsylvania, in fact. And now this very nice Mr. Bechtold reminds me that he is a displaced person. I suppose he has always lived in this country. I suppose he would like to have somebody guide him by the hand to where his rights used to be.

I have a telegram from F. M. Buchanan, of St. Louis, Mo., who says nothing except three very important words:

May freedom win.

I love that word "freedom," Mr. President. I think—and I am not disrespectful—that many of my colleagues have forgotten what freedom really means. Some of my colleagues whom I admire most, and whom I consider very good friends of mine, have, out of a natural curiosity, said, "Why does this question mean so much to you?" My only answer has been that I believe in freedom.

I desire to read soon, Mr. President, something that I saw this morning in one of the newspapers about a meeting which was held in the Westchester apartments, where I live. Apparently a couple of nights ago many of the tenants in the Westchester had some sort of a meeting, a protest gathering, at which they were vehemently in opposition to the intended purpose, or they think it is, of the management, if rent control is eliminated, of turning that magnificent facility into a cooperative. The tenants do not want that to happen. In a word, the distinguished persons who live at the Westchester, on the basis of their meeting the other night, thought they were on sound ground in telling some other American what that other American could do with what belonged to him and not to them. Some member of the press called me up last night at home and asked if I had attended such a meeting, and I laughed out loud. He said, "I understand exactly what you mean." I made a comment to him that I think is fundamental, that if such persons as live in the Westchester apartments in Washington, D. C., the Capital of the United States, are not qualified, prepared, and anxiously determined to stand on their own feet and to take care of themselves 365 days of every year, then any such fight as I and any other Senators think we are waging in the name of simple freedom is a useless futility.

Do Senators know who live in the Westchester? Presumably they attended that meeting of tenants last night—and that is a sign of the times. There are Cabinet members, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, distinguished business leaders, Supreme Court Justices, and others of the very highest reputation. They are among America's—and I do not want to be misunderstood—upper 10 percent. They are the leadership to whom America looks for guidance. Without having any desire to get into any trouble with my neighbors, whom I enjoy, I merely want in passing to say, "Quit. Respect and assume your own responsibilities and your own rights. But if you believe in freedom for yourselves, permit freedom to be extended to the other person, even though his use of that freedom may impose some need for sacrifice on yourself."

I could laugh at the question asked me the other night, because I had an experience a couple of years ago, when I was fighting against rent controls, I think it was in 1947 or 1948. I was called to a meeting in the District Committee room. When I reached there I found seven or eight of my colleagues. We were all very good friends and we all visited together. It struck me as being very strange that we all lived at the same place, that is at the Westchester. I was late in coming to the meeting, and I said, "Gentlemen, what are we meeting for?" The reply was, "You have heard, have you not, that the manager is trying to raise our rent?" I said, "Yes; I heard about it, but what about it?" He can, as I understand, submit his figures and request to the Housing Expediter. If the Expediter agrees that

he is entitled to the increase, he should have it." "Oh no," I was told, "it is not so simple as that. We do not want an increase." "Oh," I said, "that is a different question. What do you propose to do about it?" They said they were going to protest. That there was going to be a public hearing. Being very naive then, and probably being naive today, I said, "I should like to be there and watch you protest." "Oh," they said, "no, no. Do not misunderstand. We are not going to protest ourselves. We are going to do it through an attorney, and we have had this little meeting today to see if we cannot raise some money." "Well," I said, "count me out. I happen to believe in the rights of the other fellow."

We used to jockey with such questions, and it would be said: "All right, HARRY CAIN, if your rent goes up, and you cannot afford to pay it, where will you move?" I have invariably said to people who have asked that question, "That is none of your business."

Mr. President, there may be some persons in this country who are not qualified to take care of themselves, who cannot think for themselves, who do not know where to go when they need help and relief and assistance. But if Members of the United States Senate do not know how to take care of themselves we simply should close up shop and turn all the remaining power, small as it is that is left, over to the executive branch—and that is not being uncritical politically of the administration—and let it go at that.

I have a telegram from Mr. D. J. Zimmerman, of Indianapolis, Ind., who says very simply:

Congratulations for your fight for economic competition. Hope you get help.

Mr. Zimmerman, my reply to you is that I hope I do, too.

Mrs. D. J. Townsend, of 1117 East First Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah, says:

I approve of what you are doing for rent decontrol. Let's keep our country free please.

Sometimes a courteous person can get a great deal of help which that person had not expected. When an American citizen says, "Please do a little something to restore and maintain freedom" it would be an unusual Member of this body, I think, who would disregard the request.

Mrs. T. F. Jackson, of 1455 Bryan Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah, says:

Congratulations, Senator CAIN, on your stand on rent control. Keep fighting for the freedom of the American people.

I doubt if two persons who sent telegrams from Salt Lake City had any conversation between themselves before they sent those telegrams, although both struck the same keynote.

Here is a telegram from Kansas City, signed by F. A. Gubera, Mrs. Julia Gubera, Mrs. Amy Elders, Charles Elders, Mr. Rudy Gubera, and Mrs. Mary Herman:

As a token of appreciation from some loyal free thinking American citizens for your noble stand alone—

They call it "noble"—

against the injustices of rent control and infringement of property rights. May God

give you strength. With a sincere mutual interest in good government.

Barbara C. Schmidt, of St. Louis, Mo., sends me the following telegram:

God help you and give you strength to continue filibuster on rent control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], for the purpose of permitting him to make a unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for the Senate until Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in San Francisco, Calif., there is a family by the name of Skidmore; they live at 701 Park Avenue. The telegram they send to me reads as follows:

Thank God we still have men—

Mr. President, they are not saying that to me personally—

with the courage to challenge that which is un-American. More power to you.

Mr. President, I think there are a very great many Americans in the Congress, some of whom it sometimes occurs to me do not work very hard at their trade; at least, that is my view.

Frances R. Lee, of 4165 Druid Lane, Dallas, Tex., says in a telegram to me:

We do not want rent control in Texas, nor do we want our money spent enforcing Federal rent controls in other States.

In other words, Mr. President, other States which have not done what they had a chance to do, when they had a chance to do as Texas has done.

Emma Secker, of 5530 Alton Street, Dallas, Tex., telegraphs me as follows:

DEAR SIR: We do not need rent control in Texas. There are plenty of houses and apartments available. Also we do not want our money spent forcing Federal control on other States.

Mr. President, her message is a slight variation from the message in the telegram I read just previously. In the preceding telegram, which also came from Dallas, Tex., Frances Lee said:

Nor do we want our money spent enforcing Federal rent controls in other States.

In a similar vein, Emma Secker, also of Dallas, telegraphs to me, in all her self-respect:

We * * * in Texas * * * do not want our money spent forcing Federal control on other States.

Here is another telegram from Dallas, Tex.—this one coming from Clara Peebles:

God bless you. Texans don't want their money spent continuing rent controls for others.

Mr. President, I like Texas; I like Texans. No one can know anything about the history of Texas without having a great admiration for the desire of Texans to be themselves, to be free, and to stand on their own feet.

From Grand Rapids, Mich., from a gentleman by the name of I. R. Bland-

ford, I have received the following rather prosaic but forceful telegram:

Congratulations on your stand against rent control. Keep fighting.

Mr. President, I can only say to Mr. Blandford that I am doing the best I can, up to the present time.

Harry A. Hurley, of 1531 Westminster Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, is another gentleman who has sent me a telegram. Incidentally, Mr. President, I have just thought of something; I have noticed that half a dozen telegrams have come to me from residents of Utah. Those telegrams are interspersed throughout the bulk of the telegrams I have received. However, I now realize that I should have segregated the telegrams coming from Utah, and should have presented them in a group, so that the Senators from Utah would have had them clearly brought to their attention.

Mr. Hurley in his telegram says:

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Heard the good news that was broadcast to all people this morning.

In other words, Mr. President, apparently there is no secret about it.

Mr. Hurley then says:

You have our fullest support in maintaining the freedoms of our Constitution. We, in Utah, desire to support only our State and ask that you keep up the good work.

Mr. President, the next telegram I shall read comes to me from a number of persons, namely, George C. Moulton, Elizabeth C. Babbitt, Sam W. Morgan, Celia M. Lively, William E. Clark, and Bayard M. Wooten. They have sent me a telegram from New Bern, N. C. Personally, I do not know just where that community is located in the great State of North Carolina. Their telegram reads as follows:

Congratulations. Rent-control law unconstitutional, confiscation of property, hard on small people.

Mr. President, I should guess that those who sent me that telegram represent the "small people" they mention in it; and I would imagine that last night, or the night before, all of them were sitting around in someone's parlor or living room, discussing this situation; and, as a group of Americans, they probably said, "The Senator is saying what we think. Let us bother enough to send him some encouragement."

Mr. President, in connection with my position regarding the pending rent-control-extension bill, it may be said that I am an optimist. However, I think that if one cannot be an optimist, he cannot be anything. When we start to fight against something which has been "loaded for bear," when we begin to struggle against something the skids for which were beautifully greased, we necessarily have to be optimists if we are going to get anywhere.

The point is that the skids were designed to put Senate bill 3181 through the Senate of the United States—if not, first, on Wednesday, then on Thursday. However, now it is Friday. Although I can see the machine coming down those greased skids, yet at least a few cinders have been laid along the track, here and there, and the machine is not moving with its intended rapidity.

Mr. President, from Tacoma, Wash., a gentleman whom I know, and whom I like very well, Mr. C. R. Edrington, telegraphs me to say:

May God bless you for your fight for human rights.

I think Mr. Edrington is right. I think all too often we emphasize the materialism of property in connection with this question; but Mr. Edrington goes to the heart of this subject, which is that a human being is possessed of rights which qualify him to hold title to things material; and if we wish to permit him to retain what, in a material way, is his, we must first recognize his fundamental rights as a human being.

Another telegram which I have received from Tacoma, Wash., comes from Kenyon Yauger, whom I do not know personally. He says in his telegram that he is happy over what he thinks is "a valiant fight" and effort to keep a wrong from being done in the peacetime year of 1950.

Mr. President, I should think that if I were to go to Texas and if I said to many of the people there, "If you do something good in Texas, don't you think that ought to be a pattern for the people in the other sections of the country, and other people ought to be able to do the good things that you do?" the answer would be, for the most part, "Well, within reason they ought to be able to do it. We would like to have them try to do it."

I mention that, Mr. President, because a Mr. Jack Pinkston, of Dallas, Tex., who lives at 406 North Windomere Street, in Dallas, has sent me the following telegram:

Rent decontrol highly successful in Texas. We neither need nor want rent control reimposed here, nor do we want our money spent enforcing Federal rent control in other States.

Mr. President, I wish to pose a fundamental, most important question: If decontrol has been good for Dallas, Houston, Amarillo, and goodness knows how many other cities and communities in Texas, why should not the same thing be good for the citizens of Seattle, Wash., and perhaps of Butte, Mont., if it continues under Federal rent controls today, and of Los Angeles and San Francisco and Sacramento and Portland, Oreg., and all the other fine, splendid cities throughout the West and East and the North and the South?

Mr. President, during the years of my own greatest concern over the property-management question, it has generally been stated by many people that we must continue Federal rent control, otherwise we will injure the rights of American veterans.

Mr. Lynn G. Ernst, of North Hollywood, Calif., commander of the ninth district of the Disabled American Veterans, sends me the following telegram:

You are doing swell job, comrade. Keep it up.

Circumstances permitting, before the conclusion of this debate I shall try to prove to the American veterans who care to think about the question, that one of the greatest disservices ever done them was the continuation of Federal rent

control in the years 1947, 1948, and 1949. There are tens of thousands of American veterans who, returning from the wars and finding no place in which to live, as the result of continuing Federal rent control, have been imposed upon, through the good intention but wrongly designed procedures of their own Government, and have been required to buy houses at prices which were inflated, and on which they will be trying to pay off the mortgage—in many instances, unsuccessfully—for years to come. I do not know the veteran who sent me this telegram but he must believe in freedom. The chances are he has taken 5 minutes in which to study the economics of this question. If, by way of argument, we said that every American veteran was in favor of continuing Federal rent control, we should have to say that two veterans were opposed to it—one, the junior Senator from Washington, the other, the commander of the ninth district of the Disabled American Veterans.

But the facts are, Mr. President, that many more veterans know that there is a retrogression in terms of rental accommodations under rent control, and they share with me the hope that they will be done away with this year.

Mrs. Fanny Rich, of 700 West College, Coleman, Tex., whom the senior Senator from Texas perhaps knows, sends the following telegram:

We do not want rent control in Texas, nor do we want our money spent enforcing Federal rent controls in other States (other than Texas).

From Salt Lake City, Mr. Gerald P. Werrett, of 2673 Kenwood, sends the following telegram:

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Congratulations on your efforts (and those of others) toward the (abolition) of rent controls. I, as a citizen, do not wish to continue to pay taxes to support any socialized legislation (of this character).

There are many ways of expressing opposition, but I think in the 4 years I have been a Member of the Senate this is the first time that average people who are prohibited from using the floor of the Senate to speak for themselves, have ever had someone rise to speak and speak for them.

The next telegram is from Baltimore, Md. It is signed by Mr. C. Philip Pitt. He belongs to the Maryland Home Builders Association. I do not know the character of the membership of that association, but I like the name, and I know that in many communities the Home Builders Association is a prideful group of people. They are the ones who fundamentally built 900,000 or more new homes in this country last year. They represent the type of organization which, in this enlightened fifth decade of the twentieth century is often looked upon with suspicion. Some people think evil of them. I think them good American organizations. Mr. Pitt says:

Congratulations on your courageous and forthright stand against extension any longer of Federal rent controls.

I am not concerned about the word "courageous"; that is a totally relative word, which does not move me one way or the other. I like the reference to the word "forthright." That is what I

should like to believe I am endeavoring to be, in some reasonably competent fashion. Mr. Pitt continues:

Decency and justice to many millions of thrifty property owners demand termination of this vicious law, which was generally accepted 8 years ago as a necessary wartime evil.

Is there any Senator on the other side of the aisle who will rise to say that even when Federal rent controls were justified, they were not recognized as being what they are—an insidious evil? Of course, we will admit that they are an evil. Our every determination ought to be to get rid of them as soon as we can, and I have criticism for no man or group of men when I deplore the fact that those who sponsor such legislation as that which is now before the Senate will not take the time to defend it but try to make those of us who dissent accept it. The only rational conclusion I can draw is that if the proponents will take as much time in defending it as some of us are willing to take in attacking it, our questions will tear down the ramparts of any defense they attempt to construct in the Senate of the United States for an outmoded and an archaic institution called Federal rent control in the year 1950.

I wish to return pretty soon, probably within a few moments, to a discussion of this question: How can it be that in the Senate of the United States when we are attempting to discuss intelligently a great national problem such as the Federal management of private property, which certainly should be discussed fully, the advocates of the extension of such a law speak in its defense for not more than 5 minutes? At least, when the junior Senator from Washington and his associates have concluded, there will be no reason for any man, woman, or child in the United States to be in doubt as to the reasons why we attack a continuation of this law; but unless the advocates of the proposed law change their minds and start fighting for the adoption of what they scurried here with last Wednesday, there will be few, if any, persons in the United States qualified to say why the law is justified. We have the RECORD so that Senators may make their views known, and if those who are absent at this time, busy with other work, read the RECORD and dissent from anything which the junior Senator from Washington has said, they can on tomorrow, Monday, Tuesday, or whenever it suits their convenience, take exception to his comments.

Mr. President, I have received more than one telegram from Tacoma. Here is one from a Mrs. Creso. I know Mr. and Mrs. Creso. They are landlords. They own an apartment house. They do not sign the telegram as being owners of an apartment house. Perhaps it did not occur to them. It is quite a small apartment house. I do not know how many units it has, but no one would refer to Mr. and Mrs. Creso as being big or wealthy citizens. They are first-class citizens who have certain rights which they wish to have reestablished. They send one sentence, as follows:

We surely appreciate your fight to kill Federal rent control.

Here is another telegram from Salt Lake City, Utah. I am sorry my good friend, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is not present, because I am digging up quite a number of telegrams from persons whom he might grow to like very much. The same goes for the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. E. A. Weight, of Salt Lake City, says:

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Hang on. Feel you are right. Why should Utahans pay for rent control for Illinois—

And because he is a conservative, frugal man, he adds a comma and "and so forth." I assume he used Illinois merely as an example. It happens, by the way, to be the most outstanding example in the country.

Here is a telegram which I should refer to the Senators from Pennsylvania. It is signed by J. Howard Cooper, executive vice president, Property Owners' Association of Philadelphia. I suppose that organization includes big property owners, small, medium size, and all the others. The telegram says:

Keep it up. You are doing fine. Five hundred thousand property owners backing you up.

I do not know anything about the political situation in the State of Pennsylvania, and it is not any of my business, but I know that one of my colleagues in the Senate is engaged in a political campaign in that State. He probably finds it a very interesting and difficult campaign. Almost every Senator does who has a campaign. If there are 500,000 property owners there, they could be extraordinarily valuable by way of assistance to any Senator or Representative, be he Republican or Democrat.

Here is a telegram from Modesto, Calif., which is a nice, small, hospitable community. The telegram is from A. B. Pike. It says:

Senator CAIN, keep up your filibuster.

That is what he calls it.

We rental-property owner slaves with you 100 percent. We are entitled to free enterprise the same as the rest of the United States.

I also think so. One of my great criticisms of the bill is that, after having returned all other elements of our economic and social structure to competition, it undertakes to say, in substance, that for so long a time as there are more renters than there are property owners, rent controls shall continue to be imposed throughout the country.

The next is a telegram from Mobile, Ala. I think Alabama has already decontrolled. If not, it will do so soon. This telegram is from Tom Geary, who says:

Congratulations on your efforts to remove the bureaucratic shackles on property owners of this Nation.

It cost him something to send that telegram. From one point of view it is not any of his concern, unless he is a thoughtful person, as he appears to be, whether the Federal Government does something to the State of Washington, for example, or whether it does not.

There is no likelihood of the Federal Government's doing anything in the field of rent control insofar as the State of Alabama is concerned, but Mr. Geary is, first, a citizen of the United States and a first-rate American, and, second, he is a citizen of Alabama. In recognizing that as a citizen of Alabama he has rights, he thinks, that citizens of other States have the same rights.

The next telegram is from John and Davis Roberts, Mobile, Ala., saying:

Congratulations on your fight for free enterprise. Let us return to the freedom of property ownership.

The next telegram is from Mrs. Rosa M. Smoot, Los Angeles, Calif. She has a cute phrase at the end of the telegram. She says:

Keep up the fight. Save principles of free enterprise our American way.

She concludes by saying:

Commies will hate you for this.

That would not upset me very much.

Mr. Charles M. Howe, of Salt Lake City, Utah, gets right down to business. He is perfectly willing to leave most of the business to the junior Senator from Washington. He says:

Keep talking. We are 100 percent behind you.

I would call to his attention the fact that they are a couple of thousands of miles behind me. I wish they were here, so they could share a part of the responsibility which I bear, very broadly, in their names and in the names of other persons located throughout the Nation.

From San Jose, Calif., Mr. W. C. Rice sends me a telegram saying:

Please accept our encouragement—

I like that, Mr. President. One needs encouragement in a job like this—

on your marvelous fight on rent-control law. City Council of San Jose voted 5 to 1 for decontrol at meeting last night. Keep up the good work.

I am pleased to know that San Jose has been released from the shackles of a Federal feudalism. I know of no other way in which to properly characterize it.

I have a telegram before me from Harry E. Draa. It is a most unusual spelling for a name. It is D-r-a-a. The telegram comes from Grand Rapids, Mich. Mr. Draa wires as follows:

Congratulations on your fight on rent control. Hope that you are able to make the other Senators realize that our good United States does not need this yoke any longer.

I may say to Mr. Draa that I do not know to what extent I can convince any other Member of the Senate of anything. The very least I am endeavoring to do is to make available to them through the RECORD information and facts which to my mind justify prohibiting the Federal Government from further invading the rights of ordinary and average Americans such as he and I.

Herbert F. White, of Elizabeth, N. J., telegraphs in a complimentary sense:

Congratulations on your heroic stand against rent control.

Again I see nothing heroic about it. It has been on very few occasions indeed

that I have heard a story told on the floor of the Senate. Certainly I have never tried to tell one. However, the constant reference to heroism, heroic, or courageous, terms which are relative, reminds me of a story which I hope my good friend, the acting majority leader, the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], will not resent my telling, or be upset by it. I had a friend who had made a little money. He went to Alaska to invest it. He thought he would buy a barber shop, which he did. He did so even though he was not a barber. Finally an unwary and unsuspecting citizen of Alaska came in and took his seat, and had his face lathered by my friend, who then went about his business. When he was about halfway through, my friend, the purported barber, said to his customer, "How am I doing?"

His customer said, "That is entirely relative. If you are skinning me, all right. If you are shaving me, it hurts like hell."

I was reminded of that story not only because it emphasizes the word "relative," but because it reminded me of the accelerated, atomic, jet propulsion which was used on Wednesday to bring S. 3181 before the Senate as its pending business. I was shocked on that occasion to have the senior Senator from Illinois offer the motion, to have the Vice President, who was then occupying the chair, put the question, and to have the question disposed of with a speed which was far greater than that of light. So that most things are relative.

Mrs. Elizabeth Foley, of St. Louis, Mo., merely says:

Accept deepest gratitude your stand on rent control.

From Elizabeth, N. J., Laforde La-tourette sends a telegram. I presume that the name is French in its origin and probably represents the head of a French family of the first or second generation in this country. I notice that he makes reference to "heroic." The French do enjoy coloring their language. He merely says:

Congratulations on your heroic stand against rent control.

From West Orange, N. J., comes a telegram which is no different in substance from any of the others, but it comes from a different location. Mr. and Mrs. W. Douglas Frizer, of 8 Colony Drive East, West Orange, N. J., wire:

Congratulations on your work against rent control.

Mrs. Lucille Ward, of Dallas, Tex., telegraphs:

We don't want rent control in Texas. Housing exceeds demand here. We don't want our tax money spent forcing Federal rent control in other States. Thanks for statesmen like you.

To Mrs. Ward I would say that I am not certain what a statesman is. The Senator from Washington has been in competitive public life for 10 years. It has been a rich, exciting, and generally a very satisfying experience. But it has been a business, Mr. President, like many other businesses. The only difference

between what the Senator from Washington is attempting to do this afternoon and what other men are doing in pursuit of their own business is that I, like every other Senator, does his work in a goldfish bowl. Almost every other American has a right to pursue his enterprises in the privacy of his own accommodations. We in public life must work in the open. That is quite proper. However, I have never had either the time or perhaps the knowledge to determine what a statesman was or is. My only ambition is to be a working Senator, I suppose.

Pearl K. Goldberg, 60 Park Place, Newark, N. J., says a very strange thing to me in her telegram. I have never thought it to be so, and do not think it so now, but it is nice of her to think so, although I am disturbed that she must think so. She says:

The downtrodden taxpayer has finally found a champion in you. My sincere good wishes for your success.

Well, Miss Goldberg, there are a great many other people who are interested in you as a taxpayer, and I am grateful that you count me among the others. The telegram is worded differently. It is rather interesting to note how many different approaches these people take in their telegrams. It is rather indicative, it seems to me, that no one with a rubber stamp has told them what to say.

Here is a telegram from Louis A. Enders, 2319 Montrose, Chicago:

Thanks for your efforts in preserving the backbone of our country.

I take it, Mr. Enders, what you refer to as being the backbone are the home owners and the 8,000,000 little people who own and operate for profit accommodations, having on the average nine units or less. If those are the ones to whom you refer, Mr. Enders in Chicago, I share your view on the subject.

Thomas D. Nind, of Grand Rapids, Mich., telegraphs:

Sincere congratulations for your untiring—

Parenthetically, it has been thus far—untiring effort against rent-control extension.

I think it ought to be noted in passing—and I have tried to note it each time as it has happened—that the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] now occupies the chair. I think he is about the fourth, fifth, or sixth occupant of the chair since the Senate convened at noon. It seems a little unfair, but really it is not. It would seem that one occupant of the chair in the United States Senate would be enough for any working day, and that some arrangement could be made for a series of Senators to speak on the same subject from the same script.

I notice my friend, Mr. HOMER ANGELL, a Member of the House of Representatives from the great and sovereign and free American State of Oregon, in the rear of the Chamber. Perhaps he is here just as a visitor for a few minutes, because he likewise believes in fighting for things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). May the Chair interrupt the distinguished Senator from Washington to propound a question?

Mr. CAIN. My only reluctance at the moment to say "Yes" is that by no means would I wish to embarrass the Chair. If he has established through the Parliamentarian that it is proper for him to do that, the junior Senator from Washington would like to answer any question the Chair has in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair fears he would have to ask it from the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Ask the question from the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. On the basis of what has happened during the afternoon it will not be long before the present occupant of the chair will at least pass to the floor as he leaves the chair on his way somewhere else, and if he has the time then to pause to ask the question, the Senator from Washington would like to answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was wondering whether the distinguished Senator from Washington was still untired.

Mr. CAIN. I think that is a fair question, and I think the answer, to use a word I referred to in a story a few minutes ago, is that relatively, no, he is not tired. Years and years and decades and decades ago, when our Government was first being formed, as is known by the Senator from Delaware and me and others who are not unmindful of what history taught us, those who struggled and fought so well to build a nation in which free men and women would have a chance to live in the future must have been faced with situations which were of such great concern and concentrated interest to them that they did not stop very often to wonder whether they were tired.

There is no relationship between the capacity of those predecessors of ours and the Senator from Washington. But that is not the point. The point about tiredness is that when one has his mind attuned to a subject which he thinks justifies a considerable and full-scale effort, he becomes much less tired over a long period of time than he would in a very few minutes when he was utterly bored with or uninterested in what he was trying to do, when he had not his heart in it.

Perhaps that ought to be emphasized just a bit. My good friend the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is not on the floor at the moment. I may say to Mr. McMurray that what I am about to say will not be sufficiently strong to justify him in bringing the Senator back into the Chamber, but on Wednesday when the senior Senator from South Carolina presented the pending bill, in 5 minutes or less, he gave me the impression of being more tired than I feel I am tired after having spoken for some considerable length of time in excess of 5 minutes, because, Mr. President, my heart is in this work, and my support is for those who have been so kind as to send me a word and ask to be heard.

Herbert F. Goldberg, of 60 Park Place, Newark, N. J., telegraphed as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your determined fight against further rent control. It is time that rents receive the same treatment as any other commodity in this country. Congratulations again. My sincere best wishes.

There is much to be said for that gentleman's position.

Mrs. M. E. Hanson, of Tacoma, Wash., merely says:

Sincere congratulations on your fight to kill the rent-control bill.

Here is a telegram from Yakima, Wash. I had better read this because it comes from two persons who are good citizens of Yakima, and because it uses a pretty strong word which is often used by many people in that area when they are annoyed by something they do not like, or by the presence of something which they think is very unfair or unnecessary. The telegram reads:

Your courageous fight against the lousy rent control is certainly appreciated here. Yakima has been much better off since we got rid of it.

Yakima is a place of about 25,000 or perhaps 40,000 population now, for it has grown rather rapidly, but it is a first-class city. Many dire predictions were made as to what would happen to the fine city of Yakima if rents were decontrolled. But these two citizens, Jim and Hattie Foley, who can be traced down, over their signature have said it was a fine thing to get rid of rent control.

I do not understand the next telegram, but I think I had better read it. It is signed by "B Strong Women's Legislative Council." It reads:

Keep up the good work against rent control.

Mr. President, it has taken some time to read what after all are only a handful of the expressions which have come, I am informed by my office, literally by the thousands in the last 2 days. I asked my office to provide me only with a handful of them, to prove the point as to those whom I thought I was representing. The only question submitted to my office was, "Are these telegrams coming merely from isolated sections in America, or are they coming, as I hope, from practically every city, town, hamlet, community, and State in America?" The answer was, "They are coming from everywhere."

I am glad to receive these messages, and I hope I shall receive many more. After reading them into the RECORD on tomorrow, when I know that I shall enjoy these expressions on the part of Americans generally as they speak for themselves in their telegrams, one might suppose that it would be proper to submit more of them, and for the same legitimate American purpose.

Mr. President, for the next few minutes I desire to talk about a situation in the South, and to do so in a very complimentary way. In trying to prepare myself in a constructive way for this debate, I went back and reread all the debate which took place between May 5, when the majority leader failed to invoke cloture, when it was tried, and on May 19. I read every word of it. Having a

great admiration for the ability and the stamina of the Senators from the sovereign States, I wanted to analyze the methods they used in defeating a proposal in which they did not believe.

I wanted to do it for several reasons. I wanted to learn something, and I did. Then I wanted to see why it was that a Senator friend of mine on this side of the aisle said, "Senator, if you speak at length, you are likely to alienate the affections of some of your colleagues." I wanted to read the *RECORD* and find what it was the southern Senators did in speaking longer, may I suggest, than I hope I may have to, that did not result in their losing the admiration and respect of any Member of the Senate or throughout the country. Many Senators disbelieved in what the southern Senators were attempting to do, but I have never heard any Senator in his right mind criticize a southern Senator for speaking against what he thought should not become a law.

Because of what I learned on Wednesday I was struck by the fact that the majority leader moved to take up the FEPC bill at the beginning of a new legislative day. I knew that something had happened. I was here at my desk when the majority leader moved to bring up this bill. The Vice President said, "Those in favor say 'aye.'" Those opposed say "no." I was the only Senator who said "no." I said, "Mr. President, I seek to speak to the motion," and the Vice President informed me in his genial and invariably courteous but very explicit way, "The motion is not debatable."

It occurred to me that only several weeks ago we had what on the surface appeared to be a comparable situation, and I was curious how it was that the motion in which the Senator from Washington was interested was not debatable while the southern Senators took from the 5th of May to the 19th of May to debate a motion on a bill which has not become the pending business since. If other Senators do not think I have been busy during the last week in terms of trying to find out who was doing what to whom, they are sadly mistaken.

Because of the fact that the motion to take up the FEPC bill was not brought up on a new legislative day but on one which had lasted for some time, the motion was debatable. And a great debate it was. On Wednesday the majority leader moved to take up the Federal rent control bill during the morning hour on a day which followed an adjournment of the Senate, and this fact, I was taught in the school of hard knocks on Wednesday, prohibited the motion from being debatable. My curiosity has been aroused in a very deep way about why the majority leader did not attempt to bring the FEPC bill before the Senate in the same manner in which he so rapidly, oh, and effectively and strategically, brought the Federal rent control bill to our collective and official attention on Wednesday. This story in its entirety, however, belongs to another day, and those who are doing a little further research for me on the question have not yet returned their findings.

There are now present on the floor two Senators from States below the

Mason and Dixon' line, and when I find out I will make all the information I receive available to them. I likewise will provide the information to the majority leader, because he has said, I think, that the motion with respect to the FEPC bill would be brought up again during the present session of the Congress. If there is a way for him to have the motion to consider the FEPC bill agreed to without debate, that will be one hurdle which has never been surmounted by the proponents of the FEPC, and will, I think, save the Senate several weeks of laborious, if stimulating, work. I do not know what I am going to be able to prove through the facts brought to me by others; but if I find that there was no reasonable reason why the motion to bring up the FEPC bill should not have been made in the morning hour following an adjournment, so that there would be no possible debate, and the Senate could proceed to debate the bill itself, if other Senators do not think I will call that to the attention of not only the Senate but the Nation, they have another guess coming. I am curious about the 2 weeks' debate on the FEPC bill, and I say so feelingly to my good friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. President, I was among those who voted to impose cloture on the motion to bring up the FEPC bill. This meant that I was opposing what most of the southern Senators thought was the right thing to do. The southern Senators, in holding firm to their deep convictions, successfully defeated the FEPC proposal for the time being, despite the fact that the Senator from Washington and a good many other Senators voted to impose cloture on the motion to consider that bill.

The opposition of the southern Senators consumed many days of precious time. This is why I mention the South. I am fighting not only for fair play for American citizens outside Congress, but I want to establish my right as a Member of the United States Senate to fight for what I believe in as strongly as Senators from the South believed in their opposition to the FEPC. But the southern Senators are not less well thought of merely because they consumed a good deal of time in opposing the wishes of other Senators. Southern Senators believed that the cause they stood for was right, and they acted accordingly. They were fighting for the right of their own States to pursue what their States thought was the right course to pursue. In a way, and in a very real way, too, the junior Senator from Washington is attempting to do the very same thing. He is merely doing all he can to require States to do for themselves, if they think it must be done, what the Federal Government, through this proposed extension of Federal rent controls, proposes to do for some of the States of the Union.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Washington does not intend to imply, does he, that any one of the southern Senators to whom he has referred as opposing the taking up of the FEPC bill,

would do anything toward imposing cloture on the Senator from Washington in his present debate?

Mr. CAIN. By no means; absolutely no. I was merely, perhaps selfishly, as an individual Senator who does not yet know the strength of the support behind him on the floor of the United States Senate, desiring to make it clear to Senators whom he respects and admires that in this field of endeavor the Senator from Washington is going to try to be as successful, by using the same methods, as were the Senators from the South from May 5 through May 19 in seeing that what they did not want to happen did not come to pass. The Senator from Alabama will know what I mean when I say that my only reference to the South was as deeply complimentary as it conceivably could be. There is something important to any individual insofar as his origin, the place of his birth, is concerned. In having had what to me was the great privilege of being born in the Volunteer State of Tennessee, it is as natural as drinking water to compliment that area whenever a legitimate chance arises.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator will admit that one southern Senator, the Senator from South Carolina, who was acting majority leader the other night, did everything he could, at that time, as acting majority leader, in cooperation with the Senator from Washington, to make certain that the Senator would have the floor today, and that it would be agreed that when the Senate recessed the Senator would be recognized as having the floor when the Senate reconvened on the day following the call of the calendar?

Mr. CAIN. Will my good friend the Senator from South Carolina let me endorse the conduct to which he has just referred as strongly as I can?

Mr. MAYBANK. It was my belief that the Senator should be so recognized. I acted upon the basis of that belief.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington was very grateful, among other things, for the extreme consideration given to the rights of this individual Senator as those rights were protected by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from South Carolina, on Wednesday.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield for one other question?

Mr. CAIN. I certainly will.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to propound a question, in the form of a statement, if I may obtain permission to do so without interfering with the rights of the Senator from Washington.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I simply wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Washington to the fact that during the FEPC debate most of the time was consumed by other Senators on other matters that did not concern the FEPC, during most of the days of the debate. In other words, various other

subjects were discussed during that time by others than southern Senators. The southern Senators did not speak for any considerable length of time, and certainly there was no filibuster indulged in by them. In fact, their discussion was extremely limited. I had to wait until almost the last day before I could talk on the FEPC, and then I had to reduce the remarks I had prepared from about 4 or 5 hours down to about half an hour, because many other Senators took time to talk about foreign aid, the ECA, and various other matters.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think the senior Senator from South Carolina has as delightful a sense of humor as does any other citizen of South Carolina, whose citizens are noted for their sense of humor.

My point is that regardless of the interruptions, the southern Senators continued to do what they felt they had to do, and did so until their purpose was achieved.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is nice to have the Senator from South Carolina agree with me, because both of us believe in the same thing.

It is only a coincidence that it took 3 weeks to have the attempt to invoke cloture made; but from my observation of the southern Senators in operation, they were willing to continue for as long as they could stand in fighting the things to which they were opposed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will it be agreeable to the Senator from Washington to have me pose a question to the majority leader, with a view to the possibility of having the Senate take a 10-minute recess, during which Senators could discuss the possibility of arriving at an understanding in regard to the present situation?

Mr. CAIN. First, Mr. President, I will agree to permit a colloquy between any two Senators, if such a request is accepted by the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator mean that he will permit that to be done if it is understood that he will not thereby lose his rights to the floor?

Mr. CAIN. Yes. Of course, I have no means of knowing what the colloquy will be, but that is not my concern. If I am permitted to yield for that purpose, I wish to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request to permit the Senator from Washington to yield for that purpose? Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, let me ask the majority leader whether he would be agreeable to having the Senate take a brief recess, during which Senators can determine whether some agreement can be reached.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Maine, I should like to say that earlier in the day such a recess was taken. The minority leader, the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], reported that he thought there might be a possibility, at approximately

4:30 or 5 o'clock this afternoon, of working out some agreement.

I now understand that the Senator from Nebraska is unavoidably absent, because of a slight illness.

I have no hesitancy in making such a unanimous-consent request, Mr. President. I now request that the Senate stand in recess for 10 minutes, so as to give the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Maine, and other Senators an opportunity to discuss the possibility of reaching a unanimous-consent agreement. I make that request with the understanding that the Senator from Washington will not thereby lose the floor or have his parliamentary rights prejudiced in any way.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am grateful for that consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Senate will stand in recess for 10 minutes, with the understanding that the Senator from Washington will not lose his rights to the floor.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess for 10 minutes.

On the expiration of the recess (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate reassembled.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a few moments ago, as best I knew how, I complimented southern Senators, even though I disagreed with their view, when, some weeks ago, they successfully defeated a motion to consider the FEPC bill. I did that with a very selfish purpose in mind as well as a purpose which was wholly righteous, because I have long admired the courage and stick-to-itiveness of southern Senators. I desire now for a few minutes to take a look at this thing called filibuster. I had a memorandum prepared on the subject, through the courtesy of the Library of Congress. I think I might merely define the term and then comment on it for a few moments, before going to another subject.

Filibustering is apparently defined in two ways. The first is that the word "filibuster" is "an English corruption of the Dutch word 'vrijbouter,' which is translated 'freebooter' in this country, 'and was first applied to the English buccaneers of the seventeenth century, who gained a livelihood by plundering Spanish ships and settlements in the Caribbean.'

Another definition applies to a filibuster in the congressional sense. When so used, it "is the term used to describe obstructionist tactics employed by a minority in Congress, the purpose being to prevent a vote and thus to defeat legislation favored by the majority."

I presume, according to this definition, southern Senators in recent weeks were filibustering against the motion to take up the FEPC bill; and, according to that definition, the junior Senator from Washington appears to be filibustering against the passage of Senate bill 3818.

I recently became curious concerning those among our fellows, past and present, who have spoken at considerable length on subjects of supreme importance to them individually, or collectively, if more than one Senator was involved in a filibuster. There are some interesting references in the New York Times of November 19, 1942, on page 1, to a filibuster of that day. A filibuster consumed 7 days of the Senate's time in November 1942. The bill of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to repeal the poll tax was the measure under discussion and was backed by a northern and western coalition, with Senators BARKLEY and Norris leading the fight. It was opposed by a solid block of southern Senators. Among this number were Senators Tom Connally, Wall Doxey, Josiah Bailey, and Kenneth McKellar.

The debate ranged, for the most part, around parliamentary questions, and the southern Senators were able to score consistently, with a minimum of vocal strain, except on the part of Senator Wall Doxey, of Mississippi, who spoke continuously for 5 hours. Senator Bilbo, whose desk overflowed with books, threatened to speak for 30 days, but the filibuster was concluded 23 days short of that time.

By a vote of 41 to 37, the measure to impose cloture on that debate failed, and ended for that Congress further consideration of a measure against which southern Senators had filibustered for more than a week. The vote put the bill aside because of an agreement made with the opponents by Senator BARKLEY, the then majority leader, to shelve it for that Congress if his cloture motion failed.

But, Mr. President, in the history of the Senate there have been filibusters much longer than those which were staged in the 1942 fight. I should like to cite several examples.

There must have been quite a sturdy filibuster in 1879, for on the question concerning the repeal of certain election laws, 11 days were consumed by those who sought to resist intended changes.

In 1890 the Force bill debate and/or filibuster which concerned itself, likewise with certain election laws, consumed 29 days.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator permit me to ask him two or three questions with reference to the bill which is before the Senate?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that the record of the hearings on this bill fails to disclose by a preponderance of the evidence any national need, on a Nation-wide basis, for the continuation of rent control?

Mr. CAIN. In my opinion, the hearings to which the Senator from Oregon has referred were conspicuously lacking by failing to prove a continuing need for Federal rent control throughout the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that to whatever extent

there may be a need for rent control in this country at this time, that need is localized to a few scattered communities, cities, and areas in the Nation?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington has not, during the course of this debate, maintained that there were not certain communities and areas still in need of rent control, but he has maintained consistently, and from what he conceives to be the lack of substance in the record, that the question is from now on completely and solely a local and State rather than a Federal responsibility.

I may say to my friend from Oregon that since the 1949 rent law was passed by Congress nine States have been entirely removed from Federal supervision; three States, other than the nine, have, through legislative action, passed standby rent-control laws, and three other State legislatures are presently, this week, in session, during which time they can take action on the rent-control problem if they deem it proper. The State of Illinois, which includes within it the most controversial single remaining large city in the United States, namely, the city of Chicago, has called a special session of the State legislature to be convened on June 19 to consider this problem.

I think that will help to support the view of the Senator from Washington that it can hardly be maintained that Congress should pass a Federal rent-control law, when by the time the present law expires, some 16 States will have either been removed or have had a complete opportunity to remove themselves from Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Washington is aware, is he not, that in past years, on votes on rent-control legislation, the Senator from Washington and the junior Senator from Oregon have differed in that the Senator from Oregon has voted for a continuation of rent control on the basis of the bill then pending before the Senate, and the Senator from Washington has voted against the continuation of rent control?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Oregon is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Washington is aware, is he not, that the fundamental difference between the Senator from Washington and the junior Senator from Oregon on rent control in the past has been over this question of fact, namely, the existence of a Nation-wide need for rent control based upon allegations as to a then existing shortage of housing facilities?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Washington merely disagreed in that determination of judgment.

Mr. MORSE. On that question of fact?

Mr. CAIN. On that question, it has been the view of the junior Senator from Washington since 1947 that there no longer prevailed a need for a national rent law. It was, if I correctly understood it, and I thought I did, the view of the Senator from Oregon in 1947, 1948, and 1949 that there was a continuing national need justifying a Federal rent-control law.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct in that conclusion. I should like to ask an additional question of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Please do.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Washington aware of the fact that in the 1949 rent-control debate the junior Senator from Oregon took the position that whenever he became convinced that there was not a national need, based upon a Nation-wide shortage of housing facilities, for a continuation of rent control, he would vote against the continuation of rent control?

Mr. CAIN. I am probably more conscious than is any other Member of the Senate of the declaration which the Senator from Oregon made in 1949. I am conscious of it because at that time the Senator from Washington did his level best to prevail upon his friend from Oregon to agree that the time had come to justify doing away with Federal rent control, and the Senator from Oregon was not impressed sufficiently by my presentation to agree with my view.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington recall that on one occasion during the 1949 debate we had in the cloakroom a very friendly, and, may I say, from the standpoint of the Senator from Oregon, a very helpful discussion of the whole question of rent control?

Mr. CAIN. I do.

Mr. MORSE. The junior Senator from Oregon took the position that he had not become convinced, on the basis of the evidence presented by the Senator from Washington, that there was no longer a Nation-wide need for continuation of rent control.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct. I was very grateful to the Senator from Oregon for wanting to discuss the question revolving around rent control with the Senator from Washington. My distress was extremely deepened because my impression was that the Senator from Oregon was just about to be "sold"; and as evidence of that fact, we sat and discussed the question seriously, and the Senator from Oregon would say, in substance, "There is much to what you say, but I do not think there is enough you can say in this year to support conclusively the position you have taken, which is to eliminate Federal rent control." I am only guessing now, because we have had no conversation in months, in fact, that the nature of these questions would indicate that the Senator's curiosity about the subject is even more alive than it was last year, and I could not be more pleased.

Mr. MORSE. Under the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves, the junior Senator from Oregon will have to make his position clear by way of questions, if the Senator will permit another question.

Mr. CAIN. I may say that the Senator from Washington will quite normally permit questions from any Senator, but he will be most encouraged if the Senator from Oregon will submit questions which might lead to a further bit of help in answering the question, Who are those likely to be supporting the position maintained by the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington recall that in our discussion last year the junior Senator from Oregon took the position that, although the preponderance of evidence in the Record of last year indicated that there was still sufficient need for rent control, based upon a Nation-wide shortage, to justify his voting for the then so-called compromise rent-control bill, which permitted of local decontrol, nevertheless, he wished to give notice that in his opinion, if the housing conditions continued to improve as they were then improving, he believed that by the end of the year there would not be any need for any additional Federal legislation for the continuation of rent control?

Mr. CAIN. Although in 1949 I disagreed with the contentions offered to me by the Senator from Oregon, I remember them in almost precisely the language the Senator from Oregon has used.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington recall that in our discussion of the question of the continuation of rent control the junior Senator from Oregon explained his position to the Senator from Washington by saying, "So far as I am concerned, I am going to act upon this issue as I try to act on all issues, namely, in accordance with what I think is a sound Federal principle that should be applied whenever the Federal Government seeks to exercise jurisdiction over any domestic question"?

Mr. CAIN. I do indeed, sir.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington recall that in discussing that Federal principle I took the position that we cannot justify as a matter of governmental philosophy the Federal Government exercising jurisdiction over any question which has become solely or primarily a local question and lost its Federal characteristics.

Mr. CAIN. I am very conscious of that presentation which was made to me and other Senators, as I recall, a little more than a year ago.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Washington be surprised, then, on the basis of discussions which the junior Senator from Oregon has had with other Members of the Senate, and in the course of the debate itself on rent control, to find the junior Senator from Oregon taking the position this year that, on the basis of the evidence which has been advanced in the hearings of the committee so far and in the debate on the floor so far, as read and heard by the junior Senator from Oregon, he feels the proponents of the pending bill have failed to show by the preponderance of the evidence that there is a Nation-wide need because of a Nation-wide housing shortage for a continuation of rent control insofar as the exercise of Federal jurisdiction is concerned?

Mr. CAIN. Because I highly respect the mental faculties of the junior Senator from Oregon, even though we have often disagreed on questions—and it should be stated also that we have often agreed—I would be completely and conclusively amazed had the Senator from Oregon reached any other conclusion than the one he has just offered to the

Senator from Washington. I do not think it possible that thoughtful or studious men or women who read the record which was written before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate could conclude that the witnesses who appeared there had established a continuing need for Federal rent controls.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that if it be true, as I believe it to be, that there are some localities, particularly some great cities, where in all probability there still exists a sufficient shortage of housing to justify some consideration of rent control on a local level, it is the duty in those instances of local governmental units, and not the Federal Government, to take care of that specific local problem?

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator from Oregon, because of what he said and because of what a good many other Members of Congress said during the debate on the rent-control question in 1949, every American community and State was given, to my way of thinking, adequate notice that they ought to begin from that time on to analyze their own local needs, because it was the intention of Congress not further to impose Federal rent controls throughout the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that the so-called local decontrol provisions of the so-called compromise bill of 1949 were put into the bill for the purpose, among others, of directing the attention of local governmental units to the need of their giving some local consideration to their own housing problems so that they could get themselves into a position of not looking further for an exercise of Federal control over a purely local matter?

Mr. CAIN. That was one of the basic reasons for those provisions being placed in the law, as advanced by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that in an issue such as this we need to be constantly on guard against legislation which seeks to have the Federal Government exercise control over local problems when such local problems have ceased to represent a Nation-wide problem affecting the people of the country as a whole?

Mr. CAIN. I wish, sir, that I had your ability with words. I have worked pretty hard during several days of this debate to convince our colleagues in the Senate that we must not permit ourselves to do for any American State what that American State not only can but must do for itself. I have contended that it was proper for the Congress to establish a Federal rent-control system, provided—and only provided—that a national emergency existed. Because in recent months the national emergency has been dissipated and done away with, the remaining areas which are confronted with a continuing need for rent controls—and it is for them to prove a continuing need for rent controls—must be a local or State concern, as opposed to a Federal concern.

Mr. MORSE. In order that that point of view may be emphasized in the Record, will the Senator from Washington permit me to ask him one further question in regard to it?

Mr. CAIN. I am very pleased by the Senator's questions, and I should like to answer as many as he may wish to ask.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that among the various questions to which each Senator must try to find the answers in this debate probably the most fundamental question of fact, on the basis of the answer to which he must bottom his whole philosophy in regard to this particular bill, is this: Is there existing today in this country a Nation-wide housing shortage to the degree that it creates a Nation-wide problem calling for national rent control?

Mr. CAIN. In my opinion, sir, that cannot be established to be a fact, for among other reasons there is the reason that on the first day of April 1949, there were fourteen million - seventy thousand - four hundred and some odd rental units under control throughout the country, whereas, as of June 30, 1950, the day on which the 1949 act is expected to be terminated, there will be remaining under control slightly in excess of 7,000,000 units, or less than 50 percent of the number of units under control 13 months ago, when in the opinion of the Senator from Oregon and other Senators—and in fact in the opinion of a majority of the Senators—there still continued a national emergency. However, as of that time most of the Senators said: "The question is very tight in our minds. We are in doubt. Being in doubt, we shall vote to continue the controls for one more extended period." Yet they were slightly in doubt at that time. They certainly must have no doubt concerning the elimination of a national emergency as of this moment, because, in part, of the abbreviated fact I have just offered to my friend, the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Speaking hypothetically for a moment, if it is true that in a given hypothetical case an individual Senator has reached the finding of fact, in answer to the question previously put by the junior Senator from Oregon, that the evidence this year does not show a Nation-wide need or a Nation-wide problem for continuation of rent control on a Nation-wide basis, then does not that Senator find himself faced with the next question: "How or on what theory or principle of government can I then justify a vote for the pending rent-control bill, in view of my individual finding that there is no Nation-wide housing shortage to the extent that justifies the continuation of rent control on a national basis?"

Mr. CAIN. I am literally convinced in my own mind that any objective study will establish the fact of the lack of a present-day national emergency.

Mr. MORSE. Finding that lack to exist, is it not true that then the individual Senator must answer the next question: "On what legal theory or theory of government can I justify a vote for the exercise of a Federal jurisdiction over a problem which the facts show is no longer Federal in nature?"

Mr. CAIN. How any Member of the Senate or of the Congress can vote for or how any citizen can support an extension of the Federal rent-control system if that Senator or Representative or citizen agrees that a national emergency no longer exists, I frankly do not know.

If the primary contention of those of us who are attacking this bill is correct—and I established it 2 minutes after I started this afternoon—that no national emergency continues to exist, then it is my American conviction that we of the Congress would be doing the American people, the States of the Union, the cities of America, and the Federal Government itself, a criminal disservice by permitting the Federal Government to manage those affairs which the establishment of the fact of there being no national emergency literally and conclusively and morally and honestly and politically and every other way forbids, and ought to prohibit the Federal Government from doing.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Washington that in the court decisions to date upholding the national rent-control legislation, one of the fundamental underlying legal principles, if not the basic legal principle that bottoms all those decisions is that Federal jurisdiction on the part of the Congress to pass rent-control laws springs from the existence of the national emergency growing out of a Nation-wide or national housing shortage?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington does not possess the great knowledge of the law which is possessed by the Senator from Oregon. I have only been able to study, approach, and finally to attack this problem, on the basis of what I consider to be economic facts.

My casual understanding—and it is no more than that—of what the Senator from Oregon has said, I presume from his knowledge of the law, is not such as to enable me to reflect further on court decisions, because in that field I am a rank amateur.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, however, that during the last several years, when the Senator was taking an active interest in rent-control problems, he has consulted from time to time his lawyer friends in the Senate and the country—

Mr. CAIN. A good many.

Mr. MORSE. In regard to legal justification for the passage by the Federal Government, through the Congress, of rent-control legislation?

Mr. CAIN. My legal friends have advised me that the only justification for a Federal rent-control law is the existence of a national emergency.

Mr. MORSE. Then we come back again, do we not, to the fundamental question, whether or not there exists, as a matter of fact, at the present time a Nation-wide emergency, by way of a Nation-wide housing shortage, which justifies the continuation of rent control?

Mr. CAIN. That is the fundamental question involved in the entire argument. If there is no national emergency, there obviously should be no Federal rent-control law, and those who are of that opinion should fight against its

passage for any time which is required. On the other hand, if it can be established that there is a continuing national emergency, then I believe the question is an entirely different one.

Mr. MORSE. The last part of the Senator's comment leads to the next question which I should like to ask him, if he will do me the kindness of yielding.

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If an individual Senator reaches the conclusion, as the junior Senator from Oregon has reached it, that the facts and evidence in the record do not show a Nation-wide housing shortage to any degree that justifies a conclusion that there should be a continuation of rent control on the basis of any theory of an existing national emergency, a vote for the pending bill by any such Senator would be a vote on the basis of a theory which he knows cannot be reconciled with the underlying legal theories of the court decisions to date justifying or sustaining rent-control legislation.

Mr. CAIN. Under those circumstances a vote in favor of the pending measure by any Senator would be a complete repudiation of everything for which that Senator stands, and all the responsibilities he assumes when he takes his oath of office.

Mr. MORSE. Would it not be true, then, that if a Senator reached the conclusion, as the junior Senator from Oregon has reached it, that the facts in this record do not support a finding that there is a Nation-wide housing shortage to any such degree as to justify an opinion that there is a Nation-wide need for rent control, if he then voted for the pending bill he would be voting for a legal theory which is not supported in the court decisions to date sustaining such rent-control legislation as has been passed heretofore by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Oregon is quite correct. In addition to that, from my point of view, he would be voting for a legal theory which I have never known to be recognized as being legitimate or valid in these United States. He would be voting for a theory which holds that the Federal Government shall act as a Federal instrument for only a portion of a country, in a particular problem, in the management of private property, and I think that is not a tenable position.

Mr. MORSE. He would be voting, would he not, in the very face of his finding of facts that there was no national need for a Nation-wide rent-control bill based upon any Nation-wide housing shortage, for the exercise of a Federal jurisdiction over what had become a purely local problem?

Mr. CAIN. That is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Washington agree with me that one of the dangers we need to watch out for in this country is that of a constantly expanding of Federal jurisdiction on the part of the Federal Government over purely local problems and local matters, which ought to be handled by local governmental units if we are going to keep strong our Federal system, which is not a system based upon any

theory of the destruction of local governmental jurisdiction and responsibility?

Mr. CAIN. It seems to me that the greatest and most positive menace to the future happiness, health, and welfare of America stems from a possible continuing encroachment of the Federal Government on the rights of individuals generally, and on the responsibilities which ought to be assumed by State and local governments. In working this problem, I want to suggest to my very good friend from Oregon that I think we are faced with such a situation that we of the Congress, with reference to particular areas which are requesting assistance, must, because we have already established the lack, I think, of a national emergency, say to them, "This is not a case of whether or not you want to manage your own affairs. It is a case in which we must tell you you must assume that responsibility, for the Federal Government simply cannot do for you what you must do for yourselves if you expect to help in maintaining a healthy balance between our city, State, and Federal governmental structures."

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that this particular issue presents to the Senate of the United States, at least in the opinion of the Senator from Washington, and I can assure him, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Oregon, the question: When shall we bring to an end the exercise of Federal jurisdiction over a problem that has ceased to be Nation-wide in nature?

Mr. CAIN. In the opinion of the Senator from Washington we of the Congress should always be looking for every possible chance to eliminate the Federal Government from controls imposed upon subordinate levels of government and of Americans as individuals generally, because of a national emergency arising out of the war. We ought not to let those issues come to us; we ought to be looking for them, and every time we have an opportunity we should help everybody by restoring to a State or a community or an individual a right which belonged to it or him before the war.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now ask my last question, and I want to say by way of preface to it that I appreciate very much the opportunity that the Senator from Washington has given me to make my record clear on this particular bill through this colloquy of questions and answers which I have put to and received from the Senator from Washington.

Under the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves I was not in a position where I could do it on my own time, but I wanted to do it this afternoon because I may not be here next week, and I wanted to make myself perfectly clear on the record as to why I shall be paired against the pending bill. So I put this final question to the Senator from Washington:

Does he agree with me that if a Senator reaches the conclusions which he and I have reached in connection with the questions I put to him this afternoon, then that Senator simply has no course of action that he can justify following other than a vote against this

bill, first, because of his finding of fact that there has not been a showing by the proponents that there is a Nation-wide need for the continuation of rent control based upon a Nation-wide shortage of housing facilities; and, second, because of his firm belief that whenever a problem has ceased to be Federal in nature but has become solely local in nature, and when the jurisdiction as a matter of law of the Federal Government can spring in connection with such problems only from the existence of a Federal need, of a Federal emergency, as the courts have held constantly in connection with rent-control legislation, then there is no course of action—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I am going to object now if there are any more speeches made in the Senator's time.

Mr. MORSE. I ask to have the reporter read back my remarks, and let the reporter determine whether or not they are in the form of a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am going to claim the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Oregon for having asked what I thought were very legitimate questions.

Mr. MORSE. A point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think I have the floor, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state his point of order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the floor had been yielded to me for a question. The question has been raised as to whether I asked a question. I ask to have the Official Reporter determine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor, and the time is within his control.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington yielded to the Senator from Oregon for the purpose of his asking or addressing some questions to the Senator from Washington. Now it is the opinion of the Senator from Washington that the Senator from Oregon has at no time done other than ask questions, questions important to a reasonable resolution of this debate.

I am not an authority on parliamentary procedure, though I am learning more about it each day, but if there is any reason why the Senator from Oregon cannot have his words just offered to the Senator from Washington read aloud to the Senate I should like to know what that reason is, because in those words, which to my mind were in the form of a question, the Senator from Oregon had merely said, after deep study and arriving at a conviction that a national emergency no longer exists—"Could I?"—Does not that sound like a question? Could I, a Member of the United States Senate, do other than vote strongly

against the pending bill? If that is what the Senator from Oregon was attempting to establish through questions, I think the American people will be interested in the position he is now assuming and the reasons for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CAIN. May I yield for the purpose of permitting the Senator from Oregon to submit a parliamentary question?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question, which I understand any Senator can do at any time.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Washington be so kind as to ask the Presiding Officer of the Senate if the junior Senator from Oregon was in order at the time the majority leader objected to his proceeding?

Mr. CAIN. That is a very fair question.

Mr. President, a colleague of ours is in some understandable distress at the minute. He wishes me to ask of you, sir, if the junior Senator from Oregon was in order when recently he was offering some questions to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I claim the floor under that sort of a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary for the Chair to have the assistance of the Parliamentarian. The Senator is propounding a question to the Chair.

Mr. CAIN. Yes; and if a Senator has no right, Mr. President, to address a question to the occupant of the chair, I should like to be so advised, and if he has a right so to do, I should like to be advised as to why the majority leader takes exception to a normal course of procedure.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

Mr. CAIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. What, from the point of view of the Chair, is the present immediate situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. Is it possible for the Senator from Washington, who has the floor, to accommodate what he took to be a very legitimate request by an associate of his, the junior Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have asked that as a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the Senator from Washington can yield to any other Senator for a bona fide question.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, please, sir—and I make

it in order that I may be guided properly during the remainder of the evening. My parliamentary question is this, whether it is permissible and completely legitimate for a Senator who holds the floor to yield for a question offered by any of his colleagues. What is the rule which permits, not the majority leader as such, but any other Senator to question the right of a Senator who holds the floor to yield for the purpose of permitting a question to be asked by another Senator?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will rule that a Senator having the floor has the privilege and right of yielding for a question; but the question must be a bona fide question, and must not be a statement in the guise of a question.

Mr. CAIN. All that the Senator from Oregon seeks to do is to know what the rules of combat are, for it is a two-way street, and now we will establish what is and what is not a bona fide question.

Mr. President, I now yield for the purpose of permitting a question to be asked by my friend, the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Oregon request the Senator from Washington to yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. He did.

Mr. MORSE. I did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for that purpose, sir.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask my colleague, the Senator from Washington, this question: Is it the opinion of the Senator from Washington, that if the junior Senator from Oregon reaches the conclusion that on the basis of the facts and evidence presented in the record on this bill, there is insufficient showing of a Nation-wide need for a continuation of rent control because of any Nation-wide shortage of housing facilities, and if he is convinced that as a matter of a principle of law applied to those facts, Federal jurisdiction cannot be justified in the extension of rent control in the absence of a national emergency, then his vote should be a vote against the pending bill?

Mr. CAIN. It is the opinion of the Senator from Washington that any Senator faced with such circumstances as those which have just been related by the Senator from Oregon, could do nothing less than vote enthusiastically in opposition to the pending bill, which is Senate bill 3181, a bill to further extend rent controls throughout the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for my last question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that on the basis of the colloquy which has been carried on between the two of us this afternoon by way of questions by the junior Senator from Oregon and answers by the junior Senator from Washington, we have endeavored to show in this debate that there is no further need, on the basis of fact, for the exten-

sion of rent control, by means of this bill, because of any shortage of housing on a Nation-wide basis?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is of the opinion that that is precisely what the Senator from Oregon has been attempting to do. The Senator from Washington has been privileged to yield to such questions as have been propounded by the Senator from Oregon, because some time, some day, a number of thoughtful persons are going to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and if Senate bill 3181 is passed, as it very well might be, as a result of 5 minutes of presentation, which can be construed to be nothing short of a generality, then I think those who read the RECORD are going to have a right to hold their heads, and to say, "What goes on in the greatest deliberative body on the face of the earth, when the information and the facts establish as a fact no national emergency justifying a continuance of Federal rent controls, and yet such a sinister system, so diabolical, when it is not authorized and permitted by a national emergency, is approved by the Senate of the United States?"

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to be advised, sir, who determines whether a question is a bona fide question. I must ask that question because I expect and hope to yield to any Members on either side of the aisle, but I should not like to lose my right to the floor because I did not know what constituted a bona fide question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that when a Senator yields to another Senator for a question, when, in the guise of a question, the words spoken constitute a statement, rather than a question, but the words are spoken in lieu of a question, under the privilege of asking a question, the Senator having the floor will jeopardize his right to the floor unless he protests the questions that are asked of him and the manner in which they are asked of him.

Mr. CAIN. Then does the Senator from Washington correctly gather that the Senator who has the floor is the judge of what is and what is not a bona fide question, and he runs a risk of losing the floor if his judgment of what is a bona fide question is not agreed to by the then occupant of the chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the risk is run by the Senator who holds the floor; and should objection be raised by any other Member of the Senate, if the Senator holding the floor has not so protected himself as to the manner in which a question was addressed to him, he does run the risk of losing the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am very thankful to the occupant of the chair for providing me with that information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair hopes that his answer has been satisfactory to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. It has been completely satisfactory, sir; and I think the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished

junior Senator from Delaware, is learning rapidly, as I am, about some of the rules and regulations of the Senate, with which we were not previously familiar.

Mr. President, before the recent colloquy between the junior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Washington, the Senator from Washington was referring to some of the so-called filibusters which have taken place on the floor of the Senate in years gone by. He wishes, in brief in this instance, merely to bring that record up to date.

In 1914 there was a filibuster or extended debate on an antitrust bill which took 21 days. In the same year, it took 31 days to resolve the question of the Panama Canal on coastwise shipping. In the same year, 32 days were consumed by a filibuster on the rivers and harbors bill. Twenty-three days were consumed in 1914 by a filibuster over the ship-purchase bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Washington, on the basis of the ruling of the Chair, that if in the course of a question-and-answer colloquy between two Senators on the floor of the Senate, a question is raised as to whether the Senator asking the question is in fact asking a question, that Senator does not have the right under the rules of the Senate to call for a reading of the statement by the official reporter for a determination of whether or not he is in order?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is unable to answer that question, but he would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CAIN. If a doubt should arise concerning the legitimacy of the form of any question directed by any Senator to any other Senator who holds the floor, does either the Senator who holds the floor or the Senator who asks the question have the right to have the question read back to the Senator who propounded it, in order that the Senate, including the two Senators in question, may determine whether it was a bona fide question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that if a condition exists, such as stated by the Senator from Washington, then the Official Reporter would be asked to read the question or statement, as the case may be.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CAIN. Did not such a situation arise a few moments ago, when the majority leader questioned the bona fide character of a question directed by the Senator from Oregon to the Senator from Washington, at which time the Senator from Oregon, if I recall correctly, asked that the question be read to him? That question has not been read back to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the Senator who has the floor that the question referred to in the last statement of the Senator from Washington be read?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington is not mistaken, the reporter will determine from his notes that the Senator from Washington made such a request a few moments ago.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am merely getting an answer to a parliamentary inquiry, immediately following which I shall be pleased to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to state to the Senator from Washington that, if his memory serves him correctly, at the time the statement was made or the question asked by the Senator from Oregon, either due to a lack of ability on the part of the Chair to consider that question before other matters were taken up before the Senate—

Mr. CAIN. They were coming rapidly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not believe that the Reporter had time, or was not given time, to read the questions.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington intended no criticism of either the Presiding Officer or of the Parliamentarian. He was merely asking for information. But, if it is proper at this time, the Senator from Washington would like to ask that the question asked by the Senator from Oregon, which was recently questioned, may at this time be read, so that the RECORD may be made very clear.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Washington referring to the question asked by the Senator from Oregon perhaps 5 minutes ago, but not just recently?

Mr. CAIN. In terms of time, I think the Presiding Officer has probably located it properly. I am referring to the question to which, as I recall, the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, intended to take exception. So it was in a sense an unfinished sentence. But I think from the substance of the question asked by the Senator from Oregon, we can determine its legitimacy. The Senator from Washington hopes and feels that he is moving in strict accord with the rules as they have been laid down for generations in the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that if the question is read and the Parliamentarian holds that it is a speech, or a speech in the guise of a question, the Senator from Washington, on a point of order, would lose the floor?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is not prepared, and I think quite properly so, to agree to what the majority leader has just said. In the first

place, the Senator from Washington is of opinion that the Senator from Oregon clearly asked him a question. The Senator from Washington would think that because he thought it to be a legitimate question, he ought to have protection by the Chair. The Senator from Washington is in no mood to try to take advantage of anyone or to indulge in any sharp practice. I think in a general way such things were disposed of on Wednesday. So that all the Senator from Washington wants to know is by what rules we are to play, from this time on.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington has his wish, the Official Reporter will read the question previously submitted by the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that other debate has taken place since the question under dispute was asked. However, if the Chair may cite his own opinion, he would say that perhaps because of his negligence in acknowledging the request at the time the majority leader addressed the statement to the Chair, he feels that, in all due fairness, the Official Reporter should be permitted to read the question.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington would be grateful to the Chair for that indulgence, and very largely so, because the Senator from Oregon had asked whether he might have his question read to him. I find myself at the moment, while endeavoring to do the best I can to protect the rights, as I see it any way, of another Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Official Reporter will read the question. By that, the Chair does not mean to imply, by the use of the word "question" that it is the interpretation of the Chair that it is a question.

Mr. CAIN. Not at all. I thought it was a question.

(The Official Reporter, Fred A. Carlson, read as follows:)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now ask my last question, and I want to say by way of preface to it that I appreciate very much the opportunity that the Senator from Washington has given me to make my record clear on this particular bill through this colloquy of questions and answers which I have put to and received from the Senator from Washington.

Under the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves I was not in a position where I could do it on my own time, but I wanted to do it this afternoon because I may not be here next week, and I wanted to make myself perfectly clear on the record as to why I shall be paired against the pending bill. So I put this final question to the Senator from Washington:

Does he agree with me that if a Senator reaches the conclusions which he and I have reached in connection with the questions I put to him this afternoon, then that Senator simply has no course of action that he can justify following other than a vote against this bill, first, because of his finding of fact that there has not been a showing by the proponents that there is a Nation-wide need for the continuation of rent control based upon a Nation-wide shortage of housing facilities, and, second, because of his firm belief that whenever a problem has ceased to be Federal in nature but has become solely local in nature, and when the jurisdiction as a matter of law of the Federal Government

can spring in connection with such problems only from the existence of a Federal need, of a Federal emergency, as the courts have held constantly in connection with rent-control legislation, then there is no course of action—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that the Chair has held that the Senator from Washington should be permitted to have the right to have the RECORD read, I make the point of order that it was not a question—it was a speech in the guise of a question if I ever heard one, and I make the point of order that as a result of that, the Senator from Washington should lose the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to be heard on the point of order—

Mr. MORSE. I do, also.

Mr. RUSSELL. I submit the point of order that the matter having transpired some time in the past, the point of order cannot now lie. It would have to be made at the time of the transgression of the rule. I have no interest in the matter except to preserve the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it is a matter of past record. The statement of the Chair would be this: In order to treat with due fairness and respect both the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Oregon, the Chair asked the reporter to read the question. In the opinion of the Chair, before the question was asked a statement was made which the Chair does not think was a bona fide question.

Mr. CAIN. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the point of order should have been submitted at the time the action took place.

Mr. LUCAS. I raised the point of order myself, and I should like to make this further observation with reference to it. I think the Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct, but the Chair, on his own initiative, took the position that the question should be read. If the Chair took that position and asked the reporter to read his notes, then there is no point in having them read unless a decision is made one way or the other. There is no point in having the remarks read unless we get a decision upon those remarks with respect to the point of order which the Senator from Illinois raised.

I shall not press the point any further. I think the Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct. I think the Chair may have been incorrect in requesting that the remarks be read, but I undertake to say that if the Chair compels remarks to be read I am convinced that I am in a position to make a point of order against those remarks. Otherwise, there is no point in having the remarks read to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the point of order was made, in order for the Chair to decide the point of order it was necessary, in the opinion of the Chair, to have the question read for the information of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not make the point of order at the time. I simply raised the parliamentary inquiry as to who had the floor as the result of the colloquy. That is the way it started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor, and he can yield only for a bona fide question.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. I noticed in listening to the reporter that the Senator from Oregon, before he propounded the question to the Senator from Washington, prefaced it with an observation. I was conscious of that before he propounded his question. I did not take exception to it, because during the several years I have been a Member of this body almost every Senator is in the habit of prefacing his question with an observation in order more strongly to support whatever thought he has in mind in connection with his question.

My parliamentary inquiry is this: Is it not proper, literally, during a debate in the Senate, for a Senator who wishes to propound a question to preface that question with an observation? I should like to know, because it will make a considerable difference in my conduct from now on. I think every other Senator will want to be advised as to whether in the future he is to be prohibited from doing anything other than asking a question and letting it go at that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that when a matter becomes technical, the Chair can hold to the strict rules of the Senate and require that a question be a bona fide question.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. How is any Senator to know when we are having a literal debate and when we are having, not a promiscuous, but let me say, a liberal debate? For example, in listening to the Senator from Oregon preface his question with an observation, I was merely taking it to be perfectly valid, because it appears to have been the custom for several years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will serve notice on the Senator from Washington who has the floor that from now on the rule will be rigidly enforced.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Chair mean to say that he will, from now on, advise any Senator who has the floor during this or any other debate that only strict questions with no prefatory remarks of any kind connected with them can be ad-

dressed by another Senator to the Senator holding the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not mean to say that any time a Senator has the floor when a question may be directed to the Senator that it shall be a question only, but it appears to the Chair that during the last few minutes it might appear that an evasion of a real question was attempted.

Mr. CAIN. May the Senator from Washington inquire by whom?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise as a matter of personal privilege. I want to take exception to those remarks of the Chair because the RECORD speaks for itself.

Mr. LUCAS. A point of order. I make the point of order that the Senator from Washington has lost the floor.

Mr. MORSE. The junior Senator from Oregon never evades anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, out of consideration for the rights of another Senator, I make this parliamentary inquiry, if I may, particularly so that I may proceed with my work: Is there any way in which the Senator from Washington can be of any service to the Senator from Oregon in respect to his recent rising to a question of personal privilege?

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. For a question; for a strict question; for a literal question.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Washington were in the position of the Senator from Oregon, would he not wait until the close of this particular debate and until such time as he can take the floor himself and express himself in no uncertain terms as to what he thinks of the comments of the Chair and the Senator from Illinois in the past few minutes?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Oregon is generally certain of what ought to be done with reference to any matter which is pending in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, having recently referred to the length of time consumed by Senators who engaged in filibusters in past years to defeat certain legislation in which they did not believe, I think it proper to refer by name and year to some of the individuals who consumed a considerable amount of the Senate's time in pursuance of what they thought was right. I had not previously known until I looked up in the Library of Congress that in 1890, 60 years ago, Senator C. J. Faulkner fought, as he thought proper to do, for 13 hours in opposing the Force bill. In 1893 Senator W. V. Allen spoke for 14 hours on the silver-purchase clause of the Sherman Act. In 1914 Senator T. E. Burton spoke 12 hours and 10 minutes on the rivers and harbors bill. In 1915 Senator Reed Smoot spoke for 11 hours and 25 minutes because he thought the ship-purchase bill was an important piece of legislation. On that same question in the year 1915 Senator Wesley L. Jones spoke for 13 hours and 55 minutes. The first day I came to the Senate of the United States as the junior Senator from

Washington and was sworn in, the desk I occupied on that day was the desk which had previously been assigned to Senator Wesley L. Jones, of the State of Washington. In 1918 Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., spoke for 18 hours and 23 minutes on the National Banking Act. In 1935 Senator Huey P. Long spoke for 15 hours and 35 minutes on the question of extending NRA. In 1938 there was before the Senate of the United States an antilynch bill. Speaking in opposition to that bill for 25 consecutive hours was the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. During my time in the Senate, and in the year 1949, on the 14th day of March, I sat for most of the time on this side of the aisle and listened to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] oppose a proposed change in the Senate rules for, I think, 12 hours and 5 minutes.

This recitation has been offered only to support by own conviction that men who feel strongly are protected in the Senate of the United States, as they ought to be protected, to have their say. As other Senators in this body have fought for what they have believed to be right for considerable periods in the past, so the Senator from Washington is doing precisely the same thing in this month of June in the year 1950.

Mr. President, I read in the local Washington press this morning that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], has announced that he would offer an amendment today to S. 3181 to include the District of Columbia in the national rent-control bill. I find this both interesting and worrisome, because the Committee on the District of Columbia has apparently held no hearings of any kind on the prevailing rental situation in the District of Columbia.

It is known to most of us that the House District Committee has before it a separate District rent-control bill, and public hearings were scheduled to begin yesterday morning at 10 a. m. The session was scheduled for all day, and more than 25 witnesses, both for and against extending rent controls in the District of Columbia, were invited to testify at the session. So interesting was that discussion, and so provocative and so inadequate, too, in a way, that I read in the press this morning the hearing was to be continued today. Those witnesses who will appear before the House committee will presumably submit that character of testimony from which a logical and reasonable decision can be reached as to whether rent controls ought to be extended in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, may I ask, sir, is it the intention of the Senate leadership to withhold judgment on the proposed Neely amendment until the House hearings are available to the Senate of the United States, or is it the intention of that same leadership to proceed in the absence of any real information? As the Senate knows, there is in effect a national rent-control law and a separate rent-control law for the District of Columbia. The proposed Neely amendment, if adopted, would result in having but one law. I think before the proposed Neely amendment is either blindly

accepted or rejected, that someone should offer as many facts as he can obtain about the question and the problem. The Senator from Washington is now preparing himself to be able to do this in some rational, reasonable, and intelligent way. Should anyone else care to do it, so much the better. However, I think it must be done by someone. It simply is not proper for us in the Senate to say in 1949 that we expect to discontinue rent controls in 1950, only to endeavor when 1950 comes around to extend controls in the District of Columbia without having bothered to take testimony from a single witness.

Mr. President, I wonder what we are trying to do in the case of the question of rent controls. I raised the question Wednesday as to whether the method by which the rent-control bill had been brought before the Senate had not been born of political expedience. Yet now we have apparently on the desk an amendment to extend controls for the District of Columbia, when no Senator of whom I know is qualified at this minute to render sound judgment as to what ought to be done.

Apparently, Mr. President, no hearings are needed on what the District of Columbia does and does not need. I suppose we can assume the citizens of the District are disfranchised anyway, and they have to be bound by what we do. They cannot take exception to anything we impose upon them. They cannot take exception to our action in taking anything away from them. They are in the position of sitting quietly by and suffering as best they can with what is being done to and for them by others, who for the most part come from hundreds and thousands of miles away.

We have this situation, I suppose, on the basis of the Neely amendment, which would provide that rent control should be extended for 6 months in the District of Columbia. Those of us who oppose extension of rent controls for the Nation likewise oppose the extension of rent controls for the District of Columbia. But in the Senate neither the opponents nor the proponents possess any facts on which to form a real judgment.

The readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be surprised to know that the question of what should be done with rent controls in the District of Columbia is raising a considerable amount of interest before a committee of the House of Representatives which is taking testimony on the question. I wonder why they are taking testimony. Why should they bother to take testimony when in the Senate it is proposed that we do something in the District of Columbia without taking testimony from anybody? I think it is an excellent trick if it can be accomplished, and perhaps it can.

In the Washington Post of this morning there is a heading that reads like this:

Cogswell warns of big rent rise if controls are dropped.

The story is written by Thomas Winship, Post reporter. I think it should be read, because at least it will tell my colleagues, whatever their views on the subject of rent controls may be, that

there are those in the Congress who would like to be heard before the Senate of the United States does anything to them. I think they are on pretty sound American ground in asking to have their hour in court. That they have had it, no one of the 96 Senators would rise in this body and state.

The article reads:

With possible expiration of District rent controls 21 days away, city officials went before a House District Subcommittee yesterday to plead for another year's extension.

District Rent Control Administrator Robert F. Cogswell carried the ball for the Commissioners, warning that local rents will "geyser" from 15 to 35 percent within the next 6 months if controls are dropped now.

Two real-estate spokesmen, in an effort to persuade Congress not to extend the act beyond its June 30 expiration date, insisted rents on the free market would rise only about 10 or 15 percent.

The emergency is over and today's housing shortage is a "myth," the private spokesman contended.

The conflicting testimony was aired at a standing-room-only hearing before the House District Judiciary Subcommittee, headed by Representative HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas.

In parentheses, Mr. President, it becomes clear in reading thus far that many citizens of the District of Columbia have a very deep interest in what is going to be done to them. There is a big room in the House Office Building in which witnesses can be accommodated, but there was not enough room to accommodate all the witnesses, so a number of them had to stand up. At least the newspaper says there was standing room only. But here in the Senate of the United States we must be in a very great hurry, judging by the attempt to adopt an amendment about which even those who offer it know nothing.

I read further:

As the confused rent situation stood last night, District officials have two legislative shots at retaining rent control.

First, they could start through the House District Committee with action on the Klein bill, which was heard yesterday. This measure would continue the District Rent Act for a full year but would decontrol non-housekeeping furnished rooms on June 30.

Second, by Senate action on an amendment filed late yesterday by Senator NEELY, Democrat, of West Virginia.

The Neely amendment would tie the District Rent Act to the national rent-extension measure, now being debated on the Senate floor.

Under the Neely proposal, local rent control would be extended only 6 months, to December 31, but it would authorize the Commissioners to further continue controls until next June 30, if they believe it to be in the public interest.

Senator MAYBANK, Democrat, of South Carolina, who is in charge of the national rent bill, has predicted his measure with the Neely amendment will clear the Senate Monday.

Parenthesis—I wonder—close parenthesis.

The Neely proposal would give the District the same option on the extra 6 months rent control as is proposed for all other cities.

In either legislative course, the District would operate under the same separate rent act as it has since the war, with minor revisions.

Only difference between the Senate and House approaches would be whether Congress would automatically give the District a full year's rent control, or just 6 months, with the second half year at the discretion of the Commissioners.

Mr. President, it would be a great howdy-do, if the Congress of the United States decided to extend rent controls throughout the Nation for 6 months, while at the same time extending rent controls for a full year in the District of Columbia. If the latter action comes to pass, someone might have a slight suspicion that some of us who occupy public office in the Nation's Capital are renters, and afraid that the property owners will gouge us if we seek to restore rents to competition.

At yesterday's House hearing Cogswell plugged for the full year's extension and Commissioner John Russell Young followed him to the witness stand, backing him to the hilt.

Young said the Commissioners have great confidence in Cogswell, that no one is better qualified to give you the true facts of the situation, and that we are supporting him.

Cogswell conceded there is a large amount of new rental construction underway in the District, but it is to a very large degree the type of housing accommodation for which there is not an acute demand.

He was referring to what he said were 8,245 elevator-type apartments being built in the city for rental at \$90 to \$155 a month.

He insisted the building boom in the suburbs is not a fair argument for removing controls since the population increase in the outskirts is more than absorbing this new housing supply.

Washington, Cogswell contended, is not being overbuilt, but it is very definitely overpriced.

Mr. President, I should like to know why it should not be overpriced with the continuing presence of rent controls.

There are a number of people I know of in the property-management business who, strangely enough, hope that rent controls will not be taken away. Among them are those who in recent years have, with the help of the Government, built a great many overpriced apartments. The owners of those facilities know one thing for sure, if they know anything—and most of them do—and that is that when the rent controls have been removed and competition restored, rents on units which have in recent years been frozen will rise, as they ought to rise, which will undeniably and insistently and, in fact, automatically, result in rents on these overpriced establishments being required to come down.

Many an owner of rental property, constructed in the past several years, is going to have almost an economic headache when rent controls have been removed. One of my contentions is that the sooner they have an opportunity to take their loss, to wash out some of the water in their overpriced facilities, the better off in the long run they and America's business structure will be.

I continue to read from the newspaper article:

"Barring an emergency, another year's control would see the rental housing situation 'straighten itself out,'" he concluded.

An interesting statement, and we ought to watch such statements, coming from

anybody who in his official capacity is a housing expediter, whether it be in Washington, D. C., Tacoma, Wash., or anywhere else in the land, or whether it comes from the Housing Expediter. In substance, since 1947 every time they have had an opportunity so to state the proposition this is the way in which they have stated it, "Barring an emergency." That phrase is designed to keep the door open. Sometimes in this country when there is no emergency, an emergency can be manufactured. So if at the beginning of any testimony in support of continuing rent controls a witness begins with "barring an emergency," it always means that you can come back to an emergency if it is necessary to employ it, and even if it is not necessary to employ it. A great many citizens can be sufficiently frightened into thinking that an emergency is just around the corner.

Barring an emergency, another year's control would see the rental housing situation straighten itself out.

The District Rent Control Administrator, Mr. Cogswell, and, with very few exceptions, every advocate of rent control I have ever listened to and heard—and from 1947, with the exception of this year, the Senator from Washington has sat and taken testimony from most of them—have always used the same approach. Given another year, one more year, the housing situation will straighten itself out. At the end of any given year they come back and the situation is just the same. There are a few exceptions to that general rule. The junior Senator from New York offered a bill this year which would impose Federal rent controls for two more years, but that is an exception to the rule. Most advocates of Federal rent control are willing to go by hurdles of 1 year at a time.

The great and significant thing about the hurdle with which we are presently confronted is that it is only half a hurdle. It is a proposal to extend rent controls for 6 months, and then through affirmative action by American communities such controls can be continued for another 6 months. The important thing is that nobody in his or her right mind a few months ago even knew of this idea of a 6 months' extension. The President of the United States did not know anything about it. In January, as Senators know, he recommended that rent control be continued for a full year by the Federal Government after June 30. That was not merely the President of the United States speaking; it was his Council of Economic Advisers, it was Mr. Leon Keyserling, together with a number of others who have spent some time on this question.

In due time the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Myers] offered a bill to extend Federal rent controls for a year. In the House the same thing was done. Then everyone started getting into trouble. It became very obvious among administration devotees that some among them had no single solitary intention of voting to extend Federal rent controls for another year because they would not dare to come home to the constituents,

they would not dare to put their heads into some of the homes where previously they had been made very welcome. So everyone started taking another look at their home front. They decided, "If the Congress, including ourselves, cannot support extensions for a year, let us think up something else." Well, they thought it up all right. They thought: "Well, we can extend rent controls for another 6 months." And everyone began to smile about that, because those who first thought of the idea said, "We have something here that ought to trap members of both political parties; both Republicans and Democrats ought to be excited about this one. We have some important elections coming along in November, and if we can extend Federal rent controls until January 1, why on the stump we can practically be all things to all people." Knowing that most people do not read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD very carefully, it was felt that no one would know whether any particular Member of Congress was for or against the proposal, and it would be a very happy compromise for everyone.

I think in terms of politics and expediency it is about the best compromise that could have been thought up, and it seems to me some political strategists were extremely astute and intelligent in finding an answer, from their point of view, to what was admittedly an impossible situation, because neither the House nor the Senate, neither Democrats nor Republicans, had any intention of doing what the President of the United States seriously recommended that we do, which was to extend Federal rent controls for a year.

I have always thought I had a sense of humor, but I suppose I have lost it, because I can see nothing humorous about a compromise of the character which is being foisted upon us now.

I continue to read from the article:

Only a few real-estate men testified yesterday, but many more are slated to present their side when hearings resume at 10 a. m. today, in room 445 of the Old House Office Building.

Mr. President, serious persons were being heard by the House committee yesterday on a question important to the residents and citizens of the District of Columbia. Yet we have a proposal concerning the extension of rent control in the District about which we have permitted no single individual from the District to be heard. Mr. President, I am constrained to think that does not make good or American or fair sense.

I continue to read:

Oliver M. Walker, president of the Washington Real Estate Board and chairman of the Joint Committee on Decontrol of District of Columbia Rents, listed some 20 reasons why he believes continuation of controls is unfair and unjust.

"Rent control is unfair," he said, in that it "penalizes one important segment of the country's population and subsidizes some 29,000,000 people who are paying 1941 rents, with 1950 salaries."

Mr. Walker is merely stating a truism. He is saying, among other things, "If you believe in fair play, you cannot believe in the continuance of rent control. If you believe in fair play for the other fellow

as well as for yourself, you must recognize that if you are a tenant living in an accommodation which carries today a 1941 or 1942 or 1943 rent, while you have in your pocket a 1950 income, it is a proper thing for controls to be removed in order that you can buy a 1950 product with a 1950 dollar."

Mr. President, I do not know to what extent the American people still believe in fair play for the other fellow as well as for themselves. If there is even one case in America where one American is being required to subsidize another American as a result of action taken by his Government, I think that Government ought to undo that action.

Mr. President, I now read further from the article in the Washington Post:

In reply to repeated questions on why so many expensively priced elevator-type apartments are being built today, he said high cost of land and restrictive FHA financing are the principal reasons.

I wonder whether we can think of any other reasons. Was not the witness simply stating a fact?

I read further from the article:

Frank J. Luchs, vice president of Shannon & Luchs Real Estate Co., suggested the committee continue the present rent act with provisions for 5 percent monthly rent increases allowable to landlords up to a 25-percent limitation. The plan, he said, would protect the tenant and, at the same time, treat the landlord fairly.

Charles J. Bauer, executive secretary of the Building Owners and Apartment Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, said rent control has not only fixed ceilings unfairly but has frozen tenure of occupants in controlled dwellings.

"Under present conditions," he said, "the average income family might be forced to go into the suburbs to find rental housing if controls are lifted."

Miss Doris G. Wilkins, consultant to the Landlord and Tenant Court, testified to the fine cooperation given her by the leading real-estate firms here but contended "de-control now would bring chaos."

About a dozen tenants of the luxurious Westchester Apartments—

Mr. President, I do not think those apartments are luxurious. I happen to live in one of them. I think they are first-rate accommodations, and nothing more—

appeared at the hearing to inform the Congressmen that extension of rent control here was their only chance of staving off management's plan to convert the building into a cooperative.

George C. Vournas, speaking for the protesters, said only 1 percent of the present tenants want to buy their own apartments under the cooperative plan. The rent act requires that at least 65 percent of the occupants must agree before the project can be converted, he explained.

Therefore, Mr. President, for reasons which you and I can understand, he wants the Rent Act extended, so that the management will be prohibited in the future from doing what it wants to do with its property.

I read further from the article:

Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington, also a Westchester tenant, said last night he would have no part of his neighbors' protest move. He did not attend the mass meeting Wednesday night, because he was "busy working on his campaign to get rid of Federal and District rent controls."

If the cooperative plan goes through, and he does not want to buy an apartment there, he said he would "simply move out."

The Senator from Washington has no desire to personalize his own situation. However, what would you do, Mr. President, if you were in my position and lived in the very splendid facility known as the Westchester Apartments, and were asked either to buy an apartment which you did not want or to pay more, for the apartment in which you happily live now, than you thought you could pay? Do you not think that if you were the Senator from Washington and his family, you would promptly move away from that apartment? If you think, Mr. President, that you would have trouble in getting a roof over your head in Washington, D. C., as of today, the Senator from Washington does not agree with that view. I would think that under continuing rent controls it might be very difficult to get what you wanted, at a price you wanted to pay.

However, that is not the question. In this country we had better begin to recognize that we must make some sacrifices and must pay something for the privilege of living in a land which is or has been and in the future ought to be free. It is not American, according to my view, to have one set of Americans who have no vested stake in someone else's property, tell that someone else how to manage or run or dispose of that property.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield to my friend the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields.

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a literal question. The Senator from Washington is constrained, because of some comments offered by the Chair during a recent absence of the Senator from Nevada from the floor, to say that it is impossible for the Senator from Nevada to ask the Senator who has the floor anything other than a question. The Senator from Nevada must make no prefatory remarks, for otherwise the Senator from Washington would lose the floor. Of course I know that is not the intention of my friend the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, with that in mind, is it the intention of the Senate practically to stop free debate on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington does not share that opinion. He thinks that things were moving rather rapidly here a few moments ago, and the occupant of the chair was trying to restrain the enthusiasm of various Senators, and he thought the best way in which to do so was to make certain that a strict interpretation of the rules of the Senate was lived up to. I know the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Washington want to obey the rules. That is the only construction I give to the curtailment of latitude.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. MALONE. Then is it the Senator's idea that they do not agree with him; therefore it is a filibuster which the distinguished junior Senator from Washington is conducting, instead of being a profound debate, as it would be if they agreed with him?

Mr. CAIN. I would rejoin by saying that I care not what anyone else calls this debate, which began on Wednesday. My satisfaction in the debate comes from the fact that up until the present time, with the one exception earlier today of reading a prayer offered in the Senate by the late Peter Marshall, my contribution to the debate has adhered strictly to the main question, which is whether or not Federal rent control shall be extended into the future.

Mr. MALONE. Then, Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Washington whether it is a fact that under rent control at the moment newly constructed buildings are not under rent control.

Mr. CAIN. Newly constructed buildings have not been under rent control for quite some time, except in this instance: The Senator from Nevada probably knows that if the buildings have been FHA guaranteed, the builders of the structures must agree with the FHA as to the rentals to be charged. Those rentals, the FHA thinks, in order to be fair, shall provide a net return of 6 percent to the builders. Mr. President, how fascinating and provocative it is to know that in the recent past, despite the rent levels that have been permitted by the FHA, it is now permitting those rents to go up because of an increase in the cost of service to the operators of the buildings. It is a completely unholy and unworthy situation in this country when we have unrestricted rents on new construction, but frozen rents on construction built prior to 1941, 1942, and 1943.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield further to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then, is it the Senator's idea that eventually we shall merely have isolated the capital already invested in housing in the United States of America, as distinguished from new capital going into the housing business?

Mr. CAIN. I think that within the past 3 years we have done a great injustice in regard to housing constructed in America for regular purposes prior to 1941, 1942, and 1943. As the Senator from Nevada well knows, most of that property was constructed, let us say, 10, 15, or 20 years ago. As the result of the imposition of a rent freeze on such property throughout the country, it has depreciated tremendously in value. There are now needed, in the aggregate, literally millions of gallons of paint, calumine, shellac, and varnish; nails by the ton are needed, new flooring, new roofing, and all the rest. It has always been

a very simple thing for one who owned no property to support rent control. I can thoroughly understand that. But when one has property in which he has invested all his savings, the income from which is regulated by procedures prescribed by the Federal Government in 1941, 1942, and 1943, the situation is different. Expenses are increasing. Tenants are living in those facilities who, on the average, have more money than they had when the housing units were frozen. Everyone likes to personalize about these things, though it does not get him very far. On the average, the American citizen, if he has done anything at all, in whatever his chosen field of endeavor may be, has \$2.50 to \$3 in his pocket today for every dollar he had as of the time of the freezing of the housing unit in which he lives as a tenant. So, even after rent controls are removed, there will be an appreciable period of time before those facilities in which the American home owner used to take great pride can be refurbished, repainted, recleaned, and revitalized as an American home.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield further to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator a question, and, if I were permitted, I should like to have said that perhaps many people had put their entire savings in housing and depended upon a reasonable income from the investment for their livelihood.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President—

Mr. MALONE. Could I ask the question, then, what effect, or what success throughout the country did the provision in the bill passed last year, have, in assigning authority to the local communities, subject to the approval of the governors of the respective States, to approve rent decontrol?

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator will permit one or two observations, it would take time to relate that story, most of which has already been written into the Record. But what a splendid thing it was that we did something worth while in passing the Rent Control Act of 1949. The greatest thing we did was to permit States to decontrol themselves, as the Senator from Nevada knows. We also permitted communities to adopt resolutions of decontrol which, if approved by the governor, would be mandatory on the Housing Expediter. There was a little suffering in that situation, because there were circumstances wherein there would be a city council of one political faith, which would favor decontrol, and which would send a resolution of decontrol to the governor's desk, where so far as I know, it still lies. I think there are such instances—how many, I do not know—for example in the State of Michigan. But, on the whole, it was a tremendously successful amendment.

Is the Senator from Nevada aware of the fact that by reason of that amendment, and only so, the State of Texas, the State of Utah, the State of Arizona, the State of Wisconsin, the States of New York, Alabama, Virginia, and Mississippi and possibly one other State

have become decontrolled? Bear in mind that the State of New York has its own rent-control law. But I may say, with great joy, to a fighting representative of the State of Nevada, that if he were to go anywhere within the State of Texas, he would find neither rent controls nor Federal agents administering them. If he were to go into the sovereign State of Virginia, he would find neither rent controls nor Federal agents administering them. The Senator from Nevada can go into nine of the American States and find them free of Federal intervention in this field of private property. I can only conclude, in the absence of testimony to the contrary, that in every State which has been decontrolled the results have been good for the people—not merely for the landlord or for the tenant, but good for all. Has either the Senator from Nevada or the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] heard of any decontrolled State moving in the direction of recontrol? Of course, he has not. Therefore, why should we assume that what has created so much good for one State would create ill effects for another State? I am very greatly pleased that the Senator from Nevada asked that question.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator then go one step further along with the provision in the pending bill? I may say that in the State of Nevada the Governor turned down the request from several communities for decontrol, but will the Senator express his opinion as to the provision leaving the matter entirely in the hands of the communities would be in order at this time, not putting the matter up to the governor of a State at all, but which would allow the matter to be handled by each community, county, or city, whatever the governing body might be, so that it would be decontrolled whenever the proper resolution was adopted by the proper body in such community?

Mr. CAIN. In fact, the bill reported by the committee removes the provision which required a governor's approval before action can be taken by a local community. The pending bill simply provides that Federal rent controls shall be continued for 6 months, from June 30, 1950, to December 31, and that Federal rent controls can be continued for an additional 6 months in those communities which by affirmative action of the proper legislative body requests the additional 6 months' extension. If such a law were passed and a local community wanted to have Federal rent controls from the first of the year until the middle of next year, it would simply adopt a resolution and submit it to the Housing Expediter in Washington and it would bypass that middle step to which the Senator from Nevada has taken some exception.

Will the Senator from Nevada permit me to answer, in part, his previous question, by stating that incorporated cities, towns, and villages have exercised their

right to decontrol themselves under the home-rule provision of the 1949 law, in 249 cases involving approximately 990,400 rental units. Actions by six States removed controls from 837,500 rental units.

Mr. MALONE. Then, if the Senator will submit to another question, the junior Senator from Washington does approve, does he not, that part of the bill which would remove any jurisdiction from the governor, or, in fact, anyone having anything to do with passing on decontrol, excepting the community itself?

Mr. CAIN. I am by no means certain that I fully understand the significance of that provision in the proposed law. I do not know whether it would be proper for the Federal Government to bypass the governors of American States in taking action on community problems within those areas. I think that question should be thoughtfully and thoroughly explored during this debate by other Senators who are better qualified to do it than I am. The junior Senator from Washington replies to those who, because they feel that Congress, in April of 1949, served due notice on the American people, the States, counties, communities, and every other subdivision of government, that the Federal Government was going to get out of the field of managing private property, and because all the results from decontrolling States, communities, and areas have been so beneficial to so many people, we insistently are of the opinion that there is no further need or justification for the passage of any extended Federal rent-control system of any kind. The junior Senator from Washington and others of that view are simply against the pending bill, and we think we can support conclusively the reasonableness of our position.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada understands the position of the junior Senator from Washington, but I have a further question on that particular point. At least, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Washington, the matter should be left entirely in the hands of the local communities, with no authority for the governor or anyone else to nullify their action—if this legislation is to be approved.

Mr. CAIN. Again let me say to my friend from Nevada that I am not certain. I think it is too bad that during the course of the past year some governors have vetoed the intentions, desires, and ambitions of certain local communities. I think that is an unfortunate happening. Whether, however, as a matter of public policy, the Federal Government should establish a system through which it will do business with American communities directly rather than by going through the governors, I am not at the moment qualified to offer an opinion.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as I now prepare to offer a lot of material and facts in support of my opposition to the

pending measure, I want to define seven added reasons why Federal rent controls should not only be permitted but encouraged to lapse and die on June 30 of this year. Federal rent controls do these things:

They deny the right of free and collective bargaining between citizens. That right is denied those citizens by the continuance of Federal rent controls. A great deal of the argument in favor of continuing Federal rent controls comes from the leaders of organized labor. I do not say that the supporting documents come from the rank and file of organized labor which constitutes merely the American men and women belonging to organized labor, but they come from the leadership and generally are to the effect that if Federal rent controls are removed and rents go up, among other things, there will be another demand for a wage increase, and then perhaps another one for an added wage increase. I would not know about that, Mr. President; but on the basis of what has happened in the eight States which have been decontrolled, no such additional wage requests have resulted from the decontrol of rents. I have not heard of any such wage increases being requested on the basis of decontrolled rents in Texas, in Arizona, in Mississippi, in Utah, or in the other places in which rents have been decontrolled. But what I am always conscious of is the right of free, collective bargaining among Americans. As to many of the leaders of organized labor—and there are many distinguished Americans among them—I merely think them to be wrong in their evaluation of this American problem. It is ironic that among many of the chief proponents of continuing Federal rent controls are those who would give their lives if the right of free, collective bargaining were taken away from them.

Any man who is a member of an organized labor union or the leader of organized labor in this country is devoted to his right to free collective bargaining, and he will strike if he does not get it. On occasion he has been known to create a good deal of physical trouble if he did not have the right to free collective bargaining. If we are serious in America and if we want to lay the truth out on the table, the least we can do is to admit that we will take the right of free collective bargaining away from one segment of our society while moving heaven and earth, as we ought to do, to make it available for other segments of our society. I want some Senator, during the course of the debate, to say that the Senator from Washington is wrong in that assumption, Mr. President. Federal rent controls, to my mind, constitute an indefensible violation of property rights in a well-intentioned but unjustifiable effort to apply human rights. I think both tenants and property owners have rights. I think human rights and property rights are part and parcel of the same overriding right, and cannot be successfully separated.

Third, Federal rent control forces involuntary servitude on millions of small, thrifty, God-fearing property owners, who are the so-called little people of America. I have never actually known

an administration in our political history that talked so much about doing things for the little people which on the record in the field of property management has, rather than doing nothing at all, premeditatedly permitted such little people to have their common rights violated and besmirched. Such people seldom have an opportunity to have their case presented by a Member of this body, for example, who as an individual has never had a chance to meet one one-thousandth of 1 percent of those whom he feels he has represented as best he could this afternoon.

Fourth, Federal rent controls, Mr. President, create—and perhaps the Chair will agree with me—an ever-widening, unhealthy breach and antagonism between American property owners and historically fair-minded property users. What is the result? Nothing short of class hatred. In some places the degree of antagonism is not severe. In other places, it is very dangerous. In practically all places it is existent. Rent controls place one class of Americans against another. If we long continue rent controls all of us in America will know them to be a very unhealthy and evil thing in the years to come.

Fifth, Mr. President, Federal rent controls—and this has been stated and restated over and over again, and people state the fact and then run away from it—have caused a constant and continuous shrinkage of American supply of rental housing. There is nothing new about that situation. France first imposed federal rent controls, I think, in 1913, preparatory to going to war. It was a national emergency. It was an economic question, and it was an evil thing, but the French people patriotically said, "We will go along with it through our Government. As soon as the war is over we will get rid of controls." I do not know what war they were referring to. France did not refer to the First World War, because they did not take controls off. They repeatedly got into a political question on it, in the same manner, in my opinion, that the question got on to the floor of the Senate of the United States. France was not talking about the Second World War, because they still have rent control. I personally know that the occupant of the chair and every other Senator hopes that we shall not have a third world war. If we are not going to have a third world war, I wonder how we are going to get rent controls out of France if they continue to be hinged to some war.

We ought to think about that, because France has fewer units of rental housing for its people today than it had practically 39 years ago. Time marches on. Of course these happen to be facts. Yet we have a Housing Expediter who admits they are facts and then says, "So what?" and takes off for the country somewhere. I am concerned with America's inability to provide under continuing rent control sufficient housing to accommodate the needs of our American population. I think there are many economic factors involved in this question that ought to have precedence over the reasons of political expediency, which appear to jus-

tify a proposal to continue the law beyond June 1950.

Sixth, Mr. President, I think continuing Federal rent control, as I stated a few minutes ago to the Senator from Nevada, accelerate the physical deterioration of America's rental housing. I suppose the best way to test this characteristic and result would be to go into the rental property owner business. Most of the people who write to me on this question write in long hand. Those are the letters which this Senator likes to get anyway. They are feelingly written. They are generally written in longhand by people who seemingly mean exactly what they say. There are generally fewer frills in a handwritten letter. One knows more about a person who writes a letter by hand. In 4 years I have received such letters by the thousands, and those letters have drawn my attention to what is happening to the detriment of America's rental housing by the continuance of Federal rent controls.

Lastly, Mr. President, in this series of seven reasons, Federal rent controls continue the unholy practice of insisting that one class of American citizens be required to subsidize another class of American citizens. I do not see how a continuance of that practice can be justified by any group of Americans. Even in years gone by, when it was evident that a national emergency existed, justifying Federal rent controls, the junior Senator from Washington was always of the opinion that it was not proper for the Government to foster a system through which one class of American citizens subsidized another class. I had always held to the view that it would have been much more honest and certainly more decent if the Government had offered through an outright Federal subsidy to see that every property owner having rental property for use by others was able to make or to receive a fair return on his investment through a subsidy if a Federal law made that impossible.

Mr. President, my senatorial interest in this problem began in a positive fashion in 1947. Because of that interest I grew to know many fine people throughout the country. I wrote to them, and they wrote to me. We exchanged ideas. Out of that experience I began to think that I understood this problem of the Federal Government's management of private property. It was several years ago that among those people I grew to know, because of our preoccupation with this national rent control problem, two citizens of the State of Illinois, a Mr. John Usher and his son, Richard Usher. I think I first met them when they appeared as witnesses at their own expense before the Rent Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Ushers, it has since seemed to me, more closely restricted their consideration and study to facts than any other two persons I have ever been acquainted with or associated with in this quest of ours jointly to rid America, if we could, of the shackles of Federal rent control.

Mr. President, I am now going to explore for quite some time some findings which were submitted to me by the Ushers, which I have personally spent sev-

eral years in checking. I have found nothing wrong with the economic facts or statistics or information submitted to me by the Ushers, and I shall take it to be a great favor if any Senator, after studying these observations, can point out to me any instance in which they are incorrect.

If no one can find the information to be in error, it ought to follow the more certainly that no one can continue to find any reason of justification for supporting continuing rent controls in the year 1950.

Mr. President, during recent years we have faced a so-called housing shortage. Nearly every day the radio, magazines, and papers tell us of dire conditions due to this alleged housing shortage. We are given many facts and figures by Government and social workers who tell us what they think must be done about it. We have struggled unsuccessfully for 4 years to correct the situation, but to date we have not found the key to our troubles.

Mr. President, I am talking now about conditions as we found them to be in the year 1947; which was the first year, by the way, during which a serious attempt was made by some of us to eliminate Federal rent controls from America.

This national housing shortage started in 1943, so it might be well for us to find out just why it started at that time. Was there something unusual that happened about that time in our country? Let us find the cause if we can. We know there was no great increase in our population from 1942 to 1943, and we know that no great catastrophe destroyed much of our housing at that time. What could have created this shortage in 1943, when never before in the history of our country have we had a housing shortage? Was it due, as many people believe, to a great increase in family units because of increased marriages at that time? Some of my colleagues think that is so, and I hope they will try to establish it as being a fact tomorrow or the next day. I do not think they can.

Early in 1947 the Joint Congressional Housing Committee faced this housing dilemma, and decided to make a careful analysis of the problem. As I recall, the junior Senator from Washington was a member of that joint committee. After a preliminary study they asked the Bureau of Census to survey the population and housing of 34 metropolitan areas in the United States. I wonder how many Senators have ever bothered to look at the results of that survey made back in 1947. It took until 1950 to get them into the RECORD of the United States Senate as a result of a prevailing controversy.

AN INTELLIGENT APPROACH

This was a most intelligent and scientific approach. Most people know that the Bureau of the Census counts the population each 10 years, but few people know that they also check housing at the same time. The census worker is assisted by the mailman in every district. Each mailman charts every type of housing accommodation on his route, showing the size, type, and all necessary facts. He then lists the people living in these units. It is usually unnecessary for him to make any personal inquiries because he knows the people, whether they are

married, single, doubled up, and so forth. These breakdowns are very complete and provide all the needed housing and population data. They break the population into white and nonwhite, into male and female, and show the married couples doubled up and single people living alone.

In 1940, the regular 10-year survey gave us an accurate check of the population and housing in every town and city in the United States. In April 1947 this special survey of 34 metropolitan areas was made. The results were printed in August 1947 but were not given to the press or the general public.

In January 1948 a committee of Congress held hearings on the extension of rent controls. I remember that with great clarity. In January 1948 the junior Senator from Washington was a member of the Subcommittee on Rents of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as he was likewise in 1949.

At the time the Housing Expediter's office and other Government agencies greatly impressed our legislators by showing them certain factors in the 1947 Bureau of the Census figures. The Housing Expediter and his office have always been very generous, gratuitously so, with the advice and information and figures they have offered to the Congress. The only trouble I have ever found with the information the Housing Expediter would offer to any committee of which I was a member was that it was always and invariably difficult to understand, and when we asked questions to clear away our uncertainty, the only remaining trouble was we never got any answer. Outside of that there was nothing wrong with the information provided by the office of the Housing Expediter and the staff—aside from the fact that it was not satisfactory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CAIN. I understand the Senator from Minnesota desires to ask unanimous consent to insert something in the RECORD, or send something to the desk, and I would be much pleased to yield to him if it would not affect my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

(Mr. HUMPHREY made a statement for the RECORD regarding an amendment to H. R. 4815, to provide for medical services to non-Indians in Indian hospitals, and for other purposes, and asked unanimous consent to have Magna Carta and certain material printed as a Senate document, which matters appear earlier in today's RECORD under the appropriate headings.)

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, for just a few minutes, and for, I think, the most selfish of reasons, I am going to impose on the Senate by reading something which will give me great pleasure, but which in itself has absolutely nothing to do with the pending business. The Senator from Washington wants to find out how the golf tournament came out or is coming out, which is being held at Ardmore, Pa., and the only way in which he

can find out about it is to read it for himself, and if there are any other golfing enthusiasts present, for I claim to be one, to read it for their pleasure. I should like very much to find out how the tournament is going, and it does not seem likely that I shall have very much free time in which to read about it today or tomorrow. Mr. Thomas has kindly handed me a newspaper containing the latest results.

Yesterday Ben Hogan had a 72. I should like to know what his score was today. And, more than that, I should like to know the score of a young fellow named Lee Mackey, who is an unemployed professional, never played in an open golf tournament in his life, went upon a course on which Olin Dutra in 1931 made a score of 293, I think, against a par of 270, and promptly yesterday this young fellow who was sent out in the early morning dew, because he was unknown—nobody had heard of him, he was unemployed, therefore he could not hit a golf ball—proceeded to knock out a 64, 6 under par for the round. That was not much of an achievement, I suppose.

Golfers have been playing in the open golf championship for 50 years. This year they are playing the open in Pennsylvania. Last week I thought that is where I would be this week. How can people be so wrong? That is only to say that on the basis of prior planning I had no idea last week that the rent-control bill was going to be up this week, but this is the public's business, and the golf tournament in Ardmore is good fun—always good fun for the spectators, but a terrible time is had by the contestants. The spectators, like others I know, can watch the contestants suffer and watch them win or watch them lose. Golf is a tremendously fine game from the point of view of competition.

Now what about Mr. Hogan? What about Sam Snead? Do Senators think he is going to win? He has never won the open before. He has probably won more money than any other professional golfer this year, but he has never won the open. Sam thought this course was made to his golf swings, for he hits the golf ball an awful mile, and straight, too. But I will venture a guess that Mr. Snead is not leading at the end of 26 holes. I do not know, as a matter of fact, that this newspaper will give us any reliable information, but it will certainly give me a little relaxation for a minute.

The Evening Star has this to say in a bulletin:

ARDMORE, PA. (Special)—

From Merrell Whittlesey—

Julius Boros, Southern Pines, N. C., went over par on the last three holes of his second round in the National Open Golf Championship today and finished with a 72 for a 2-day total of 140.

And all over par in the last three holes. Seventy-two is extremely good against the tough par 70, but the pressure was getting tighter on him all the time, and his game came apart at the seams, as it can do in that sort of a competition, and he has 72 today. He had 68, I believe, yesterday. That is a total of 140 for 36 holes, and he will never be

in a better position so far as this tournament is concerned, because he has 36 tougher holes to go.

This put him in a three-way tie 72 for a 2-day total of 140. This put him in a two-way tie with Johnny Bulla and Jim Ferrier. Charley Bassler, of Rolling Road, the district open champion, finished with 77 for a total of 151.

I do not want to be disrespectful to Mr. Bassler, who is a fine golfer in his own right, but 77, for a total of 151, is not going to win him any money on Saturday when they count up the final prize winners.

Now as to Ben Hogan:

Ben Hogan missed 5-foot putts for pars on the sixteenth and seventeenth holes this afternoon, blowing a chance to take the lead in the second round of the National Open Championship at the Merion Golf Club. Hogan finished with a 1-under-par 69 for a 2-round total of 141.

Over the last week end the junior Senator from Washington had an opportunity to play in what is known as the Celebrities' Golf Tournament, which is held in Washington each year, and has been held each of the past 3 years. It is a tournament through which moneys are raised to help underprivileged and crippled children. It seeks as contestants persons in public life, in athletics of all kinds, on stage, screen, and radio, and is a tremendously successful operation. Last Saturday and Sunday that tournament was played at the Army and Navy Golf Club in Washington, D. C. The Senator from Washington, by the luck of the draw played only several four-somes behind Mr. Hogan. Hogan was around for 65 on Saturday, as I recall. He played only nine holes the second day. He was simply taking his time, and battered out a 33. He won that tournament without any trouble. That was not important. There were some other pretty good golfers there, Lew Worsham, National Open champion several years ago. Yesterday he had 82 in the first round.

One has trouble in maintaining excellence in whatever field of enterprise one's occupation takes him. Ben Hogan about a year ago was so badly crippled in an automobile accident that all who knew of it and were interested in sports and in Ben Hogan thought he would probably never play again, let alone be a competitor. He is one of the most amazing men in terms of concentration and the ability to overcome trouble, that the athletic world of America has ever known. Physically he is not so very large. I should guess he weighs about 145 pounds. He is rather short, but he can hit every shot in the golf book, and ice water runs in his veins. From the brink of disaster and total cripplement or death, in a little more than a year he has come back to make a most wonderful showing.

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

Mr. CAIN. In a moment, sir. Ben Hogan has come back to finish the end of the second round of the toughest golf tournament in the year's schedule, either at the head of the list of 155 players, or only one shot back.

Of course, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say to the Senator from Washington that the Presiding Officer, under the rules of the Senate, cannot ask questions or make comments, but I am sure he is interested in how his old friend Henry Picard is making out. Will the Senator from Washington give to the Presiding Officer, who is an old golf partner of Henry Picard, any information he has as to how Picard is making out.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be very glad to do so. I shall not take very much longer in reading the results of the tournament, because I want to get back to my discussion of the pending bill. Let me say to the Senator from South Carolina that for the first time I had the opportunity to meet personally Henry Picard last week at the Army and Navy Club, and he was knocking the ball as though he were going to be a very serious contender this week. I think he had a 71 without any trouble.

I ought to mention in passing that the junior Senator from Washington did not have a 71. I hesitate to say what my score was, when I shot in the first round last week. I suppose I can state what it was, however, because what I shot was identical with what the majority leader shot. Seeing that both of us shot 80, neither one of us will be able to criticize the other insofar as his golf game is concerned.

I continue to read:

With Julius Boros of Southern Pines, N. C., the potential leader, still playing the back nine and Lee Mackey, Jr., the jobless pro from Birmingham who shot 64 yesterday, just leaving the first tee, the par totals of 140—

Which is par—

by Jim Ferrier and Johnny Bulla were the best posted.

PAR BROKEN SIX TIMES

Par of 70 already had been broken 6 times this hot, sunny day, but a number of the big names couldn't go into the act. Sam Snead, who hasn't had a birdie in his last 32 holes, virtually can be counted out as a result of a 75 today and 73 for 148.

I am distressed. I am distressed, because Sam Snead has won many tournaments, the PGA, the Western Open, money tournaments beyond number, but the thing he wants most of all to win, the United States Open, has always eluded him, and seldom as successfully as it has done apparently in the past 2 days. Seventy-five and seventy-three for Sammy Snead over any course in all the world is the same thing as an 80 shooter shooting a 96. So I can fully understand how Sam Snead must feel tonight, and I sympathize with him.

Jimmy Demaret appeared to be slipping too far back with a 13-hole count of four over par, added to an opening 72.

Boros, a pro only 6 months, was one under par for his second round on the fourteenth tee after an opening 68.

He is doing very well. He might slip around with another 68. That would be a very tough score to match.

If he can maintain the par pace on the toughest holes on the course, he will top Ferrier and Bulla by three shots. Al Brosch, who shot 67 yesterday, was one of the last off the tee today.

BEN MISSED SHORT ONES

Hogan, followed by a sun-baked, scrambling gallery of several thousand, was three under through the fifteenth hole.

Yesterday, I noticed, the press said the course was sun baked; today the press says the gallery was sun baked.

He misjudged a 60-foot putt on the sixteenth, however, and missed the follow-up putt of 5 feet to go over par. His tee shot on the seventeenth, a par three hole, missed the green and his chip left him with another 5-footer, which he missed.

Ferrier also lost two strokes on the quarry-guarded finishing holes but finished with 69 for 140. Bulla, a putting and scrambling demon, played the back 9 in 31 for his second day 66, which was 8 shots better than his opening 74.

SNEAD'S PUTTER FAILS HIM

Snead, the pretournament favorite, practically blew himself out of the running with his scrambling five over par 75. Eight strokes over regulation for the first two rounds, there appeared to be little hope for the slugging Virginian who has missed three Open titles by two strokes and less.

Snead went out in 38 and came back in 37. His brass-headed putter again failed him, as he three putted three greens and blew his chances on the 395-yard fifteenth, where he missed his drive, hit a trap on his third blow and took two putts to get down for a two over par six.

Mackey, who set a new record yesterday, did not start out until 2 p. m. today. Harold Williams of Tuscaloosa, Ala., another little known player who drove here with Mackey from Alabama and shot a 69 on his first round, had a 40-35 today for a total of 144.

GEORGE FAZIO HAS 145

Skee Riegel, low amateur in the National Open last year, moved into contention with a 69 for 142. He was tied by Bob Toski, a bantamweight shot maker from Northampton, Mass., who also had a 69 today for 142. Toski was 3 under going into the last 5 holes, but already the finishing 5 have been a graveyard for a number of potentially middle 60 rounds.

That will no longer prove to be the case, I hope—

Woodmont Pro George Fazio—

Woodmont is a course here in Washington, D. C.—

had an odd back nine of three pars, three birdies, and three bogeys to finish with 72 for 145—

He had a 73 yesterday. He is still in a contender's position—

a score that is sure of qualifying for tomorrow's final 36 holes.

Fazio, after a 73 yesterday, was out in two-over par 38, with seven pars and a pair of bogeys. He knocked a second shot close for a birdie on the tenth, missed the green for a bogey on eleven, almost holed a pitch shot on the twelfth for another birdie, then three-putted the thirteenth. He was trapped on the fourteenth for his fifth over-par hole of the round, but rammed home a 10-footer for his third birdie on the fourteenth. George then parred the last three.

Here is a subtitle, I suppose we would call it:

Bassler uses wrong club.

A lot of us have been doing that.

District Open Champion Charley Bassler of Rolling Road, a 74-shooter the first day, played fair golf for eight holes and was two over playing the ninth. He and his caddy couldn't agree on what club to use on the 185-yard par 3, and the six-iron Charley finally

selected proved to be the wrong club. His shot flew over the green and he visited three traps before finally putting out in a 4-over par 7. He played the first four holes of the back nine in one under, but was a doubtful qualifier.

Lew Worsham, 1947 open champion who had an 82 on the first round was six strokes better today with a 76 for 158, far over the qualifying limit.

That is not very good.

Harold Oatman, of Norfolk, also was out of it with 83 added to 78 for 161, while Jack Isaacs, of Langley Field, was on the way out with 42 with his 75 of yesterday.

Mr. Thomas, if and when you run across what Mr. Picard did, I will appreciate very much being able to advise the occupant of the chair.

Mr. President, let me say with all due respect to the occupant of the chair that it has not at any time been the intention of the Senator from Washington to do other than speak to the subject; and I hope I shall be forgiven for a purely normal and natural curiosity about what happened in Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, this is a very serious presentation for the next little while—serious to my mind because it will contain nothing except what I believe to be facts.

EXTENDED RENT CONTROL

In January 1948, Mr. President, Congress held hearings on the extension of rent control. At that time the Housing Expediter's Office and other Government agencies greatly impressed our legislators by showing them certain factors of the 1947 Bureau of Census figures. They specifically emphasized two figures that seemed to prove we had a serious housing shortage. Their testimony omitted any mention of the figures that prove the opposite of their conclusion. They pointed out that Government figures showed that there were few, if any, vacant rental units and that there were a great number of married couples doubled up. These obvious facts could not be refuted.

Mr. President, there were not very many vacancies, and there were many couples doubled up. However, what concerns some of us is why that was so. The Office of the Housing Expediter has never given us any assistance, as yet, in answering the question, "Why?" I think some of us have come up with a reasonable answer, ourselves.

The omission of the other facts was the result of either ignorance or fraud. Mr. President, both those words are strong in character, and they are intended to be. We have here the testimony of the Office of the Housing Expediter, as given at the last three sessions of the Congress. In none of that testimony has the Office of the Housing Expediter provided the information which, if it was not at the disposal of the Housing Expediter, at least should have been, because he was a public official—an agent, in a way, of the body which created his office, the Congress of the United States—and he ought always to have been conscious of his primary responsibility, which was to work himself and the Office of the Housing Expediter out of a job at the earliest

possible moment. However, that has not happened.

The agents of the office of the Housing Expediter are probably still in the Senate gallery, watching what is going on here. That is a very unusual proceeding, of course, because the employees of the Office of the Housing Expediter generally subscribe to some sort of a 40-hour week. As a matter of fact, I like one who is sitting in the gallery now—Mr. Henry Van Veen. I hope he does well when he returns to private life. It is always nice to recognize him in a complimentary way, and I hope that may help him get reestablished as a private citizen when that time comes.

However, the main point, Mr. President, is—and I say this without personal prejudice to Henry Van Veen, who is an excellent fellow in his own right—that the Office of the Housing Expediter by its very nature has never recognized the need for getting rid of itself for the best interests and the common good of all Americans.

A complete analysis of all 1940 figures and all 1947 figures shows clearly that there is no housing shortage. Those are my words. Now, I have said something rather serious. I am going to have to prove my own assertion that in 1947 there was actually no housing shortage in America. But there was something, and it was very serious, and it continues to be so—a great maldistribution of housing throughout the country. There is to my mind a tremendous difference between a housing shortage on the one hand and a maldistribution of housing space which is available on the other. The complete figures definitely prove that the critical housing situation was not caused by a shortage of dwellings, an increase in population, or an increase in families. Perhaps if we can really establish those assertions as facts, the majority leader himself will rise and say, "What have I been trying to do in putting through a bill for which there is no possible economic or social justification?" I wish the majority leader would do that. However, as of this time, I am somewhat inclined to disbelieve that he will.

IMPROPER DISTRIBUTION

A comparison of the figures clearly show that from 1940 to 1947 the increase in families in these 34 metropolitan districts was only 2,582,000 whereas the available dwellings to house this increase was 2,642,000. These figures which have been secured from authoritative government sources, have been analyzed, and I should think they ought to be accepted by any reasonable individual. These dwellings were properly proportioned in the various cities to take care of the people, and would have taken care of the American people in 1947, had a free market existed.

Shortly after these early 1948 congressional hearings, a number of people made a complete analysis of these Government surveys and found many previously unrevealed facts and figures. These surveys showed there was no real housing shortage but merely a great maldistribution and hoarding of housing space by 1947 renters that was not prevalent in 1940. I think that observation

will prove to make some hard-headed sense—provided that, in connection with this question of what to do about further extending rent control, we have any interest in hard-headed economic sense.

It is a little difficult to dissociate the month of November from the facts which we are trying to analyze. These figures further show that there was more housing per person in 1947 than in 1940, even though in 1940 there were many vacancies in every metropolitan area. Most of the areas with which I was personally familiar and acquainted in 1940 had housing surpluses. I think most people who want to look at the property owners will agree that in the areas of their acquaintance that was true.

We want to bear that in mind, because if we had a housing surplus in 1940, with X amount of housing, and a housing shortage in 1947, with more housing proportionately, something is wrong somewhere. Well, something was wrong. That something which was wrong continues to be wrong in every area remaining under Federal rent control.

One never likes to assume that someone else is lacking in courage, but I think those who have disbelieved many of these figures have been unwilling to face up to, and to try to study and understand, the facts.

Between 1930 and 1940 the United States had more vacancies than had ever previously existed in the history of America. Surely we had a surplus of housing in those years, because housing properties were often sold for half of what it had cost to build them a short time previously.

Many people feel that these figures cannot be true, because they cannot find dwellings for rent. The figures are true, and we can easily understand them when we review what happened to our housing after 1942.

What then was the cause of this mysterious apparent shortage of housing? Strange as it may seem, there can be but one answer. It was brought about by rent control.

Our national housing shortage started in 1943. Why? What actually took place was a spreading out of the people—each family using more space on the average than it had ever used before. This happened because rents were frozen low while incomes increased tremendously. Merely on the basis of that one statement, we could argue the merits of it for 8 hours easily. Any American always wants to better his standard of living. Rent controls permitted the average American whose income was increasing to buy a commodity called shelter, the cost of which was frozen on a level of 1941, 1942, or 1943. It has generally seemed strange to me that the housing shortage, which was created by imposing an artificial law, did not become ever so much more acute than it did. Even here in Washington, D. C., does not everyone in this Chamber tonight who knows anything about the city know of a friend or associate or acquaintance who has an apartment here, and who at the same time has an apartment

or apartments elsewhere? The answer is that, of course, most of us have that knowledge. Admittedly some people have much more money than others, but it follows, as does night the day, and vice versa, that many an American who has been renting, not one but several facilities in recent years, has done so for one reason only. With a 1950, 1948, or 1949 income, he found it possible to afford much more than a 1941 or 1942 price tag. Yet Americans who pretend to be students of this question have denied that the existence of rent controls, in itself, tended to create an artificial housing shortage.

Because of the great number of vacancies which existed between 1930 and 1942, rents, when frozen in 1942, were less than 60 percent of the amount necessary to show a fair profit on a comparable new unit built at that time. All other principal items in our economy were frozen at a price of cost plus a profit. The Senator from Washington has often wondered why he bothers to become so excited about a business in which he has never had any selfish interest. Outside of thinking that all Americans are entitled to approximately the same rights, he does not know why he has bothered so long and has worked so hard to get rid of a vicious law concerning which most people in recent years have not become unduly excited.

Almost simultaneously with this maladjusted rent freeze came a marked increase in the income of most American families. The war brought an increase in the number of workers per household, high wages, price controls, and rationing. What happened? A housing shortage developed very quickly. It ought to have developed, and it did. Have we ever thought that even though millions of Americans went into the Armed Forces there was still a housing shortage? Here we have a confusing paradox. Most advocates of rent control do not talk about it. The paradox was simply this: There was an oversupply of rental housing in 1942 and an extreme shortage of rental housing in 1943. How did that come about? The more persons who left for the war—millions went away, tens of thousands of whom left the country entirely—the better housing became. After 10,000,000 persons had left for the war the housing shortage became a national problem. We got rid of approximately 10,000,000 people occupying rental space of one kind or another, and we created the greatest housing shortage by artificial means this country has ever known.

One reason the Senator from Washington speaks at length on this subject is that he hopes to submit for the record, as he is now trying to do, information which may be of assistance to some future Congress if this country should have another war, in the hope that God may help us to avoid some of the tragic mistakes we made during the last war.

This shortage of housing did not occur merely in one or two places; it occurred in towns and cities all over the Nation. Some cities which actually lost population to the Armed Forces and to war plants in other cities developed housing

shortages. In due time I shall be able to establish that fact.

Have we ever stopped to think about it? There was a city of X population, and much of that population went into the armed services or into war plants elsewhere, and we awoke to find there was a housing shortage. Certainly the Housing Expediter told us there was one. Did it ever occur to us how that could happen? It is not hard to achieve, however, by vesting certain authority in what was then the Office of Price Administration.

I can give my own explanation of the paradox. As the war progressed wages skyrocketed. I hope the average citizen was able to save something out of the wage increases which came to him during the war. Certainly he made more in a hurry than had ever previously been the case. But as the war went on and as wages kept getting higher, the people at home in America—everyone could not go to the other side, although many people who stayed at home wanted to go—the people at home had, among other things, more money to stay at home with than they had ever had before. They had surplus money in their pockets. What were they going to do with it? Could they spend it? In a great many directions and for a number of reasons they could not spend it. Because of rationing they found it difficult to buy anything except the bare necessities of life. They were making money faster than they could spend it. That seldom happens in the experience of an American during a normal lifetime, which is not beset by war, but under war restrictions it can be understood. If during the war one went into my part of the country as a steamfitter's helper or as a welder on a flat-top, getting ready to place guns on the flight deck so that more of the enemy could be killed—the only purpose of a war is to kill someone—working as a helper in one of these operations there was not anything in the city of Tacoma to buy. Most things were rationed, so there was more take-home pay than was previously the case. But the average American during the war could and did buy for his or her use and enjoyment, at 60 percent of its normal price, more housing. That happened everywhere. That was one thing which was not rationed even during the war. There was a "fire sale" of rental space every day of the year. We used an inflated income to buy a commodity the price of which was frozen. This resulted in unconscious hoarding of housing by renters, and the so-called housing shortage resulted with great fury in this country.

The American people have a great in-born desire to occupy spacious and ample housing, and they are to be congratulated on that desire. During the late war they found they had surplus money from increased income. The Government, by rationing, restricted their other purchasing, so here was the average American's chance to satisfy his or her desire to have a better place in which to live. Everyone ought to work toward that goal. The only thing wrong with the way in which it operated during the war was that it

created, of necessity, a housing shortage which soon resulted in being very unfair to the owners of property. Working girls, bachelors, widows, widowers, and divorced people who shared occupancy and divided rent in years gone by decided to do what? They knew for the first time they could afford to have their own apartment or house under the frozen ceiling at a price of about one-half of the real rental value. Married people without children also spread out into larger apartments.

Rents were held firm but costs of operating properties increased tremendously. So owners trying to economize caused a further shortage by insisting on minimum adult occupancy, regardless of the size of unit which became vacated for rent. Call it a mistake if you want to, but it was a pretty good mistake of human nature. What would anyone have done had he been the owner of rental property? If his income were frozen, if his costs were going up, and if he had a chance to replace a family of four with a single occupant who would use less in the way of utilities, who would be less burdensome on the apartment, and who would be less at home, the owner would do the only logical thing he could do, and that is to replace a family of three or four with a single person, and add by that much to an artificial housing shortage which was becoming tighter and tighter.

Millions of renters were forced to move from place to place during the war because of change of employment, or going into the service, and each time a family moved out the owner found that it was more profitable for him or her to rent to the smallest number of people, thus saving services and wear and tear on his property. Each move, as months went by, caused a greater and greater maldistribution, and thus a so-called shortage, which in fact was a very real shortage even though it was caused by artificial means. By the end of 1943, nearly every rental unit was occupied, and so all were frozen in or out regardless of the size of housing units needed.

Since 1943 each month has merely made matters worse. During the past four years—that would be from 1943 to 1947—thousands and thousands of housing units have been built in every large metropolitan area in an endeavor to catch up with this artificial shortage. Very few were built for rent. Nearly all were built for sale. Nevertheless, the spreading out among the renters and the squeezing out of the people by this spreading out still leaves us with a housing shortage. It ought to be clear that it will be impossible for us ever to get proper housing for the American people while we have rent control. The spreading out will take place faster than new housing can be built. We are creating a more and more false foundation for our whole American economy.

I wish I did not think that these facts were true. It would be much easier merely to swim along with the tide. But because, as one individual American and as a Senator from the State of Washington, I feel that rent controls have undeniably created an artificial housing shortage, which has brought great in-

jury and suffering not alone to property owners, but to tenants and those who would be tenants, it naturally follows that the Senator from Washington wishes he could get more Senators to share his point of view.

In 1942 more than half of all the urban housing units, over 15,000,000 of them, were rental units. Usually the larger the city the greater is its percentage of rental units. In New York, for example, more than 70 percent of all units are rental units. Thus the larger cities find the greatest maldistribution and so-called housing shortage. The smaller towns, where ownership of homes is greatest, find the least maldistribution and shortage. I know, because I have been in a great many of the congested metropolitan areas. Most of the people who live there certainly do not believe with me that rent controls have caused the hardship which has faced them. I have not been so much concerned about that, because it is difficult to take for granted that the average citizen, busy with other things, will study the economics involved in the question. However, what is sometimes distressing to me is that I find few in public life representing congested metropolitan areas who will argue the merits of this question. I have had a good many of such people say to me in substance, "Your facts may be all right, but people don't believe them." So there is no point in arguing a case which is soundly conceived if a great many people are not willing to accept one's premise as being true. The Senator from Washington has taken the other position, that once having established a premise as being true, one assumes a responsibility for trying to convince the uninformed of what the facts really are. If the Senator from Washington did not feel strongly in that foundation for his case he certainly would have sat down a long time ago.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I refer to the Senator's statement regarding maladjustments—

Mr. CAIN. Maldistribution is the word I used.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I refer to the Senator's statement with reference to the maldistribution of housing in the big cities. The Senator is aware, is he not, that most of the testimony before our committee regarding the need of rent control related to those cities?

Mr. CAIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The purpose of the optional part of the bill is to permit those cities or the States to institute rent control for themselves during the short time that it is proposed to continue Federal rent control.

Mr. CAIN. Is the Senator from Alabama suggesting to the Senator from Washington that the Committee on Banking and Currency took testimony on the bill which is the pending business?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Committee on Banking and Currency took considerable testimony on the question of rent control.

Mr. CAIN. Oh, indeed they did.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then the Senate committee decided on the type of rent

control that was desired. The Senator is aware of the fact that the principal argument was as to the need of rent control in the very type of maldistribution areas the Senator has described.

Mr. CAIN. Indeed, I am very conscious of the fact that the major portion of the testimony the committee took in favor of continuing Federal rent controls came from the larger cities.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the Senator is aware, is he not, that the conference of mayors, representing most of the cities of the United States, I assume, cities of size—

Mr. CAIN. They represent all the cities of over 50,000 population.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very strongly urged the continuance of rent control, even beyond what the committee was willing to report?

Mr. CAIN. I am fully conscious of that fact, but if they were ever to ask my advice, which I certainly am not suggesting they are compelled to do, I would say, as one who had been a mayor of a self-respecting American community, if in the future their communities thought it was necessary to continue to have rent controls, I would expect their city councils and their mayors, with the help of the governor and the legislature of the State, to do the job that was intended. As a mayor, I would want to think that if the citizens of my city got into trouble as a result of any action of any housing expediter, it would be a local expediter, that it would be a man or a woman who was responsible within the confines of the city, and I would have no situation, as a mayor of an American city, in which, in order to resolve a local problem, I would have to seek recourse to Washington, D. C., 3,000 miles away.

I feel very strongly on the subject, I wish to say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Alabama though I am very conscious of the fact that in the State of Alabama the problem is now academic, I understand through the Senator from Alabama, because Federal rent controls have been removed.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator from Washington agree or disagree that while the junior Senator from Delaware was presiding, in the chair, a just and equitable decision was rendered by the occupant of the chair?

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator mean with reference to the colloquy which resulted from the Senator from Oregon being desirous of having one of his questions read back to him?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. I am completely satisfied of the fact that the Senator from Delaware, in the period during which he was the occupant of the chair, leaned over backward in his desire to be fair. Whether or not the Senator from Delaware has laid the stage for trouble in the future as between various Senators because of his interpretation, I am not qualified to say, but I would say to the Senator from Delaware, because I respect him and the decision he made when he was in the chair, that so far as I am concerned, the Senator from Washington

will literally abide by the interpretation which the Senator from Delaware gave as the occupant of the chair. I do not know how I could be any more complimentary than that.

I think the Senator's decision, if we were all to abide by it over an extended period of time, would save a great deal of time and much trouble, and help the Senate expedite its business somewhat more rapidly. The only weakness with the decision is that I think that as soon as the present debate is over and out of the way, the decision will conveniently be forgotten.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate an opportunity to pay my respects to both the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Delaware.

I think there is only one question before the Senate; at least the first question is whether conditions throughout the country justify a further extension of Federal rent control. If the Senate agreed that there was no justification for a continuing extension of Federal rent control, it would not necessarily be saying that there was not a need for continuing controls in certain cities or States. What Senators who share my views hold to is that we see no justification for the Congress doing for States what the States and communities can do for themselves. We think that every State in the Union can do as well for itself as did the State of Alabama. We think it is time to return the management of property by a government, if it is to be governed at all, back to the States and municipalities.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly; but I think we should be certain to take the Federal Government out of the management.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator realize that the proposed extension does not take away from any State or any city the right which it has today to take decontrol action?

Mr. CAIN. I understand the intended law. But what the intended law does at the outset is to extend Federal controls on the same basis as agreed to, substantially, in the law of 1949, for 6 months, following which, if certain municipalities want to continue rent control, they can do it by affirmative action of their city councils.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator realizes, I assume, that in order to get the benefit of the extension, cities or States or areas, political subdivisions, would have to take affirmative, positive action during the first 6 months.

Mr. CAIN. I understand that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, they could not wait until the law expired and then exercise their option.

Mr. CAIN. No; I understand the action would have to be taken between July 1 and December 31, which would mean some time prior to December 31.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the purpose of extending the law during the 6 months

is to give them that benefit, if they desire to take advantage of it.

Mr. CAIN. Yes. Those of us who hold to a contrary view think that 15 months ago we served due and proper notice on every State in the Union, including the State of Alabama, from which the distinguished Senator from Alabama comes, and certainly the cities of Alabama took seriously what the Senator said on the floor of the Senate 15 months ago; namely, "My counsel to all States is to figure out what they ought to do in the future." Alabama did it. Other States have not done it.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator recognize the fact that in the southern part of the Nation, the crowded cities, the most progressive cities, the fastest growing cities, cities which really have the most serious problem of congestion of population, have almost without exception decontrolled, either by State action or by local action, under the current law—for instance, such cities as Houston and Dallas in Texas; Birmingham and Mobile in Alabama; Columbus and Savannah in Georgia; Norfolk and Arlington in Virginia; and in my own State the cities of Miami, Jacksonville, Tampa, Orlando, and St. Petersburg?

I wonder if the Senator realizes that it is a fact that the cities where the real problem exists, insofar as the Southland is concerned, have, by one means or another permitted by law, actually decontrolled themselves, and are getting along mighty well without any Government control in this field.

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to say to my friend the junior Senator from Florida that I have been fully aware for quite some time of the fast-growing southern cities which have been decontrolled, and in support of what the Senator has just said I wish to say that I have seen with my own eyes the beneficial results which have come to a good many of those cities for quite a time, and because those of us who oppose this legislation have studied the situation we are absolutely convinced that the good things which have come to Richmond and to Miami and to Jacksonville and Houston and Dallas, Tex., and other places will come to other less concentrated or less fast-growing cities, if they will but decontrol in the months ahead.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder if the Senator has any explanation which he could advance as to why in other parts of this country the same type of fast-growing cities and cities of the same size, have not seen fit to exercise their sovereign power of decision as given by the present Federal law and to decontrol themselves?

Mr. CAIN. I think one could only generalize in answer to such a question. I raised that question not long ago with reference to the city of Seattle in my own State of Washington. The answer

I received from those of whom I asked the question was that, "If the Congress does not eliminate rent controls entirely on the 30th day of June, we are promptly prepared to decontrol ourselves. But we have taken the line of least resistance and decided to wait until June of 1950."

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

Mr. CAIN. I shall be very pleased to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder if, in answer to the question I just asked, it had occurred to the Senator that perhaps the ancient but still respectable doctrine of States' rights and the ancient but still soundly democratic—spelled with a small "d"—doctrine of local government and home rule, appeals in much greater strength to those people who live in the Southland and that they, because of that conviction that local government is best, that State government is soundest, have gone much further than other parts of the Nation in decontrolling their own cities?

Mr. CAIN. I am afraid the junior Senator from Washington would be a prejudiced witness, because of the place of his own birth, which is below the Mason and Dixon's line. By way of compliment it is certainly true, to my way of thinking, that the Southern States, particularly those to which the Senator from Florida has referred, are very conscious of the rights of States. Why certain other States and municipalities have not exercised the authority provided to them under the law of 1949 I am not qualified to say. I think generally it is because the local city council and its mayor—and I can certainly understand this, having been confronted with those pressures myself—were not willing to take up a fight for decontrol. They have thought they would wait and let the Federal Government do it for them, or it must be so that in a good many cases no one has bothered to analyze and determine what the facts really are.

I have said constantly throughout this debate that there may be cities, including the city of Chicago, which need a further extension of rent control. But it seems to me that Chicago ought to be able to figure that question out for itself and do something about it.

I was in Miami shortly after the Housing Expediter was there predicting all the horrible, catastrophic evils that would result from decontrol. But now one can generally get what one wants at a price one can afford to pay. If I may do so, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida how he thinks the nice citizens of Miami are going to feel, after having gone to the trouble of decontrolling themselves, if they are now to be requested to foot the bill for continuing controls in the city of Chicago, Ill.? If I were a citizen of Miami, speaking colloquial English and the question were placed to me, I would say, "Don't be silly. My goodness gracious, do you mean to tell me in Miami that the great city of Chicago cannot do what we did months ago to the betterment of everyone here?"

That is the issue on this question. Get the Federal Government out of private

property and let the governments of the cities and the States and the municipalities do what their citizens think ought to be done. Then I think we will be getting somewhere and we will start in the direction of restoring some real authority in the hands of the States and municipalities.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Since I cannot reply to the Senator's question, I should like to ask a question in another field. The Senator has referred to the recent debate on the motion to take up FEPC. I wonder if the Senator knew that during that debate, which lasted some 10 calendar days, as I recall, from Monday to Friday in each of 2 weeks—

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. That only eight Senators spoke in opposition to the motion to take up, namely, in order, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], making only eight in all? Does the Senator realize that only eight southern Senators spoke during that debate?

Mr. CAIN. No; the Senator from Washington was not aware of that, and is very pleased that the Senator from Florida has put that fact in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I certainly will do so if the Senator will permit me to add another word of compliment, that the news the Senator has just given to me indicates how I and other Senators were completely overwhelmed, let us say, by the strategic effectiveness of the southern Senators, in the debate to which the Senator from Florida has just referred. What the Senator has said is that a small group of southern Senators was able to keep a debate going for 2 weeks by using Senators speaking on unrelated subjects, and I take that to be a masterful job of management, or "leadership" I think is the proper word. The South has always had more than its share of leaders proportionately, I take it, than practically any other area of this country.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask this question of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington. Does the Senator realize that during the course of that same debate, that is, over those same 10 days of time, there were 12 Senators who spoke in support of the motion to take up the FEPC bill, as follows, in the order in which I shall read their names: The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVEY], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from

Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], making 12 Senators in all who spoke in support of the motion to take up FEPC? Does the Senator realize that that was the case?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington did not realize that that had been the case. Again it gives rise to a further comment of admiration by the Senator from Washington for the Southern Senators, who apparently—and actually—achieved so much with so few, in terms of the debate to which the Senator from Florida has referred.

I think that would require some study, by way of analysis, to figure out. In that case there was a campaign, we might say, in which one side was attacking and the other side was defending, but the defenders generally were outnumbered by the attackers. However, the defenders were very skillful. Sometimes they engaged in retrograde movements, and they let the others, whom they considered the enemy, come on for a while; but then they put on a counterattack, from time to time, as they thought was necessary. The Senator and his associates were outnumbered in manpower 50 percent. However, at the end of 2 weeks, during which time the southern Senators used the other side's ammunition and powder, the attempt to invoke cloture was killed; and the attempt has not yet prevailed. Mr. President, I think the record the Senator has just submitted is a most extraordinary one.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from Washington realizes that during that time—the 10 days mentioned—no less than 16 Senators spoke, some at considerable length, on matters, some of which were completely extraneous to the pending issue as to whether or not the motion to take up the FEPC bill should be adopted—in other words, some 16 Senators spoke, the subjects upon which they spoke being as follows:

The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]—

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will my friend the Senator from Florida yield for a moment, to permit me to ask him this question: All of this material is being offered to me in the form of a question against which the Senator from Florida will want a response; is that true?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am confining myself—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that he is not permitted to ask any other Senator a question; that is a violation of the rule.

Mr. CAIN. Then the Senator from Washington wishes to apologize, and is grateful for the information just provided.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I say that I would not take another Senator off his feet, under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is not permitted to make a statement; he is only permitted to ask a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, observing the rule, which the Senator from Florida regards as sound, the Senator from Florida wishes to conclude his question, which is this: Does the Senator from Washington know that during that same period of 10 days during the pendency of that debate, 16 Senators spoke, some of them at great length, upon subjects entirely extraneous to the pending issue, such 16 Senators and the subjects upon which they spoke being as follows:

The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who spoke on May 9 on various matters relative to the trip of the President of the United States which was then under way.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who spoke on the same day, Tuesday, May 9, in reply to the Senator from Michigan.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who spoke on the same day, with reference to various frauds or alleged frauds in Kansas City.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who spoke on the following day, May 10, on a critical situation concerning the coal industry as the result of the importation of foreign oil.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who spoke on various international problems.

The junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who spoke at some length on other aspects of the trip of the President then current, having to do largely with the dedication of a great dam—the Coulee Dam, I believe—in the State of Washington.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who spoke on May 11 on certain aspects, previously unmentioned, of the President's trip to the West.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], who spoke on May 11 on certain aspects of the President's trip, and particularly on the unwisdom of the Columbia Valley Authority legislation, in the opinion of the Senator from Idaho.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], who spoke on May 12 on the matter of the inadvisability and the impropriety, in the opinion of that Senator, of the procedure followed in connection with the waiver of certain Senate rules in connection with notifying the President of the confirmation of certain nominations to high judicial offices.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who spoke on the same day, with reference to another nomination, that of Mr. Justice Kern, who had just taken his seat upon one of the high-ranking courts.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who spoke at some length upon the Budenz situation, which was then of considerable interest.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who spoke on May 15, upon a

subject more largely political than directly pertaining to the trip of the President.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who spoke at length on May 15, on the subject of economy in government.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], who spoke on May 16 at some length, upon a continuation of his discussion of the impropriety of certain practices in the Senate having to do with the notification of the President of the confirmation of nominations.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who spoke on May 18 on certain matters having to do with the Department of Agriculture and the conduct of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who spoke briefly preliminary to the taking up of a Senate resolution under which it was proposed to refuse to approve a reorganization plan, then pending, affecting the Department of Agriculture.

Did the Senator realize—in short—that in that period of time, some 16 speeches, relating to subjects completely extraneous to the debate which was under way, were delivered upon the floor of the Senate?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington had not been aware of the fact, and thinks the information should be included in the RECORD, and he is very grateful to the Senator from Florida for having offered that informative question.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am very pleased to yield, sir.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator realize that during that same period of time, and in addition to all of the matters transpiring which have already been set out in detail, and, I think, correctly, in the questions propounded by the Senator from Florida, five separate proposed plans of reorganization, under the so-called Hoover Commission proposals, were considered, were debated, and were debated at some length, by Senators whose names may or may not have appeared in the list already given, but, if so appearing, would have to be stated again in connection with the debates on the reorganization proposals, five in all; and that those five reorganization proposals were, in each instance, voted down by the Senate, and were rejected, by the considered and deliberate action of the Senate during that same limited period of 10 days?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington knew that certain reorganization plans had been considered during that period, but did not know that that number had been presented. The Senator from Washington, having now had an opportunity to confer with the Senator from Florida, knows ever so much more about all the facts covering the so-called filibuster by southern Democrats against the motion to take up the FEPC bill than he knew before, and the Senator from Florida has most certainly convinced the Senator from Washington that most of

the time in the 16-day period was actually consumed by other Senators speaking either in support of the motion or upon unrelated subjects.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. By way of correction, this question will restate the proper number of days consumed by the debate as 10. The Senator is asked whether he recalls that the five reorganization proposals which were actually voted down during that period of time were the following:

First. The so-called NLRB reorganization, under which a certain part of the Taft-Hartley Act would have been nullified.

Second. The so-called Treasury reorganization, under which, among other things, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency would have been transferred to and placed under the Secretary of the Treasury.

Third. The Interstate Commerce Commission Reorganization.

Fourth. The Federal Communications Commission Reorganization.

Fifth. The Department of Agriculture Reorganization.

Does the Senator remember that those five reorganization proposals were specifically debated and formally rejected by the Senate of the United States during the 10 days of the debate upon the motion to take up FEPC?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington did not recall that those five named reorganization plans were before the Senate during that period, but he appreciates the fact that the Senator from Florida says that that was the case. The Senator from Washington therefore takes it to be the case. I think the information which the Senator from Florida is offering to the Senate through a series of questions addressed to the Senator from Washington is both constructive and helpful.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is pleased to yield to his friend from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask whether the Senator recalls any more fruitful 10-day period of debate than the 10 days in which five specific major reorganization proposals were debated and disposed of by refusal of the Senate to approve the proposals, and in which, as a climax of the 10 days, the motion to apply cloture was defeated by the Senate in the afternoon of the tenth day of the debate? In short, I am asking the Senator whether he recalls any more fruitful period of 10 days insofar as actual accomplishment and actual disposal of proposed legislation is concerned, than the 10-day period to which my various questions have alluded?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Florida has convinced the Senator from Washington that during the 10-day period in question a very great amount of work was transacted on a very large number of subjects. The Senator from Washington is somewhat amazed that so much could have been done by so few in so short a period of time.

Mr. President, I now want to address myself to the subject of why rent controls failed. Before doing that, however, I suppose this is as good a time as any to read into the record a special article which was published in this morning's New York Times. I have no way of knowing how much, if any, of the allegations made in it are true. I think the record ought to speak for itself, and I think Senators who dissent from statements contained in this column of the New York Times can present contrary views on days to come, if that be their wish. I shall read the article, because it speaks of politics. It has always been my concept that the question of Federal rent controls is an economic, not a political question, and, insofar as possible, I shall concentrate on economic factors. But we have heard from time to time that some people are interested in rent controls largely for political reasons. This article, by its subtitles, pretty well takes in almost every Member of the Senate. The article was written by Clayton Knowles, special correspondent for the New York Times. It is under the Washington date line of June 8. The heading of the article is as follows:

Senate chiefs get necessary votes to pass rent bill—Democrats told measure's fate may decide whether party keeps control of Chamber—elections in North cited—key southern Members said to back extension now—LUCAS seeking early test.

In this article, Mr. Clayton Knowles says:

WASHINGTON, June 8.—The votes needed to get an extension of rent control through the Senate have been obtained, it was learned today, by a sharply administered warning to the Democrats that they might find themselves in the minority next year if the bill failed to pass.

It is understood that administration forces picked up a half dozen or more votes, said to be enough to pass the measure, by adopting this tack at a conference of Democratic Members yesterday. The bill is being debated with the leadership pressing to get agreement on a voting time.

The Members were told that the fate of this bill conceivably could decide whether or not—

And certainly everyone ought to bear in mind that the Senator from Washington did not write this article, but that he is reading it, and finds it interesting—

The Members were told that the fate of this bill conceivably could decide whether or not Senators SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois, the Democratic leader; FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania, Democratic whip; BRIEN MAHON and WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut; and HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, all up for reelection, would come back to the Senate.

There is then in the middle of the article a subtitle in three words, which is very threateningly phrased:

Southern Members warned.

I do not know who warned the southern Members. Knowing southern Members, I think they would not take very lightly any warnings.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Did the Senator mean lightly or seriously?

Mr. CAIN. I should be constrained to think neither, if I understand what my friend from Alabama has in mind; that if anyone should warn a southern Senator, the warning would not be taken seriously in the sense that the southern Senator would expect that anything harmful was going to take place; and he would not take it lightly, in the sense that, if the warning is inclined to annoy him, he in no uncertain words would tell the one who warns him to warn himself or someone else, but to get away from the one who was attempted to be intimidated—if in fact that was what was attempted; and as to that I would not know.

The warning was addressed principally to Senators from the South, many of them committee chairmen because of long tenure. They were told that, if they would rather be ranking minority members than chairmen, it would be perfectly all right for them to vote against an extension of regulation.

I do not know whether that is true, but it appeared in the New York Times, and a great many people read the New York Times. I read further from the article:

While controls might have been lifted in their own States and therefore no longer were an issue there, it was stressed, regulation was a red-hot issue in some of the Northern States where Democrats were facing stiff competition for reelection. A number of key southern Democrats immediately said that they would go along with the extension.

Mr. President, I should be less than frank if I did not say that during the course of this day I have been endeavoring to find out what this sentence meant:

A number of key southern Democrats immediately said that they would go along with the extension.

I have not yet received an answer to my curiosity.

I read further:

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, of South Carolina, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, chairman of the Rents Subcommittee, are handling the control bill, which proposes a straight 6-month extension and an additional 6 months of coverage for communities requesting it.

I think it is a fair thing for me to say, without trying to take advantage of anyone, with reference to this comment that "Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, of South Carolina, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, chairman of the Rents Subcommittee, are handling the control bill," that it is presumably a statement of fact. I know that between the two Senators, speaking in their own time—I do not think I missed a word of the debate—I have heard them offer, collectively, 5 minutes of defense for the measure, which I think is handling the subject, if not in an inadequate manner, certainly in a rather light manner.

I read further:

The pending bill against which Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington, is threatening a filibuster, is a compromise with the administration's proposal for a straight 1-year extension of regulation.

The next subtitle is "Night Session Threatened." That was a threat, if that is a proper word to use, which actually was imposed. As I understand, we are now in the midst of the night session which the majority leader threatened.

I read further:

Senator LUCAS told the Senate today that he was going to try to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement on a voting time tomorrow. He said that, if he failed, he would arrange for a night session, then bring the Senators back again Saturday. To speed up action further, the Senate will meet tomorrow at 10 a. m.

That is the first known inaccuracy in the story which I have so far seen. The Senate met, if I am not mistaken, at 11 a. m., and not at 10 a. m., as was suggested by the author of the article.

I read further:

"The Senate must get on with its business," Mr. LUCAS said. "Some Senators are anxious to wind up this session and get back among the folks at home."

Debate on the rent bill was put aside today for a call of the calendar on relatively non-controversial measures, most of them of local character. When the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, Senator CAIN, who started speaking against the bill Wednesday, will have the floor.

Two States are mentioned in this article whose Senators are said to have been threatened with possibly not coming back to the Senate if they vote against the rent-extension bill whose States have been decontrolled, so far as Federal supervision is concerned. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] represents a State which has its own control law. I know nothing about the Senator's political opportunities in the State of New York, and that does not happen to be any of my business. But I know that the rent-control issue certainly should have nothing to do, one way or the other, with his reelection.

The two Senators from the State of Connecticut should not be unduly concerned over what happens to the bill, because, if I understand correctly, the State of Connecticut has previously passed a State stand-by control law, which means that when the Federal Government removes itself from managing rents in Connecticut, if the State of Connecticut sees fit so to do it can merely call into instant operation the law which it passed sometime ago to prepare itself as a sovereign State against the day when the Federal Government would get out of the State of Connecticut with reference to rent control.

At any rate, Mr. President, I thought this story, which was called to my attention early in the day, was worthy of note, in passing, and so it has been offered for the RECORD.

I now want to address myself to a subject which is part and parcel of the whole question, and is probably the most important issue of all, because if we can convince persons generally why controls fail, those persons who are so convinced will be disinclined to place reliance on controls. It should be clear to most of us that it will be impossible for America ever to get proper housing for all the people while we have rent control. I believe that. Many people tell me it is not true,

but they have not attempted to convince me on the basis of facts that it is not true.

The spreading out under continuing rent controls will take place faster than new housing will be built. We are creating a more and more false foundation for our whole economy. This was true in 1947, which was the first year in which the Senator from Washington was required to study this question. If I have not mentioned it before I should mention now that as a freshman in the United States Senate, in the early part of 1947, I was complimented by the then chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] by being made chairman of the Subcommittee on Rents and Housing of that committee. I received that assignment within 10 days of the time I was sworn in as a United States Senator. The Senator from Washington thought that was growing very rapidly. Being from the West, and for that reason, reasonably modest, he thought such a high distinction should go his elders, and he promptly set about finding out why the member on the bottom of the totem pole had been named by the chairman of the committee as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rents and Housing. He found out in a great hurry. The Senator from New Hampshire admitted, without very much prodding, that the Senator from Washington had been offered the chairmanship of the subcommittee, and, in fact, told to accept it, after the chairmanship had been offered to every other ranking member. The reason the other members did not take the job, as I recall, in the words of the Senator from New Hampshire, was that "they are men of greater political wisdom and experience than are you, an uninitiated young Senator just come from the Pacific Northwest." In other words, no other new or old Member of the Senate would think of accepting in the year 1947 the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Rents and Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee. It was bound to be a controversial and difficult question, and the main idea was to find someone who knew so little about the question that when he was offered a chairmanship in his freshman year he would grab it before he thought.

The junior Senator from Washington lived up to the ambition of those in authority on the Committee on Banking and Currency to find someone to take that job who did not know anything about it. I have often laughed about that since. As a Member of the United States Senate it is interesting to note in passing, although it is not very important, that by deliberate choice as a result of an appointment which the junior Senator from Washington never did seek—and there was not anything else to do about it, as a matter of fact—the junior Senator from Washington is quite willing to hold in jeopardy his entire political future over this one question of the management of private property by the Federal Government.

The only way the junior Senator from Washington got mixed up in this question is that he did a job which in 1947

none of his elders, possessed as they were with what is known as political acumen, would touch with a 10-foot pole. I have often wondered, if I had had a little more political acumen as of the time I came here and had known what the chairman of the committee had in mind, whether I would have turned it down, and if I had turned it down who would have taken it. It is quite likely that there would not have been any subcommittee on rents and housing, because I was the last ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the job had already been offered to everyone else.

By way of showing the pride which the Senator from Washington takes in this question, he never has been frightened off. Whether he remains a Senator for but one term or six terms, he shall never be confronted with an important national question from which he will derive half so much real satisfaction as he has from a study of Federal rent controls, which was imposed upon him early in 1947. I think that experience taught me why controls cannot win or succeed. It certainly convinced me that the sooner we rid the country of artificial controls which create in themselves an artificial housing shortage the better off all Americans will certainly be.

Before the majority leader decides to recess the Senate tonight, the junior Senator from Washington would like to put some more telegrams from Joe Doakeses into the RECORD. I do not use the phrase "Joe Doakeses" in any complimentary sense. There are more Joe Doakeses than there are Senators, Congressmen, governors, city councils, or mayors. They are the heart and the blood and the substance of America. Their only weakness on a question such as this is that they find it difficult to get anyone to represent them proudly and openly and awfully bluntly on the floor of the Senate. However, before we find out who is thinking what about this question around the country, let us talk a little bit hardheadedly about why rent controls fail.

In 1942 more than half of all the urban housing units—that was more than 15,000,000—were rental units. Usually the larger the city is, the greater is its percentage of rental units. In New York, for example, over 70 percent are rental units. Thus, the larger cities find the greater maldistribution and so-called housing shortage. The smaller towns, where ownership of homes was always greatest, find the least maldistribution and shortage.

The occupancy cost of owned homes today is at least double the cost of comparable rental units. Did anyone ever stop to think about that? It was true in 1947. It ought to be clear that while these differences in cost continue, everyone will scramble to get their housing in rental units at half the cost, so we shall always have a shortage of frozen rental units. Most people will do so if they have any sense, and most people have sense. Everyone will scramble to get their housing in rental units. Why? Because they can buy what they want. It is like any other commodity. It is like a suit of clothes. It is buying something at

50 cents on the dollar. Why would anyone buy a house on the unregulated market when he can buy rental space at 50 cents on the dollar? I have been arguing this way for a long time. The only improvement in the situation is that in this year of 1950 there are many more people who agree with me. Whether there are enough, I am by no means certain. Because people will scramble as best they can to get into any rental accommodation which they can get for four bits on the dollar, we shall always as long as that situation continues have a shortage of frozen rental units.

Millions of housing units are now occupied by one or two people, whereas formerly they were occupied by larger families. Is that not a safe statement to make? At the end of this presentation of what I and a good many others consider to be facts on the question of rent control, those who read the RECORD will find a certified table of government figures on housing and occupancy in 1940 and 1947. This table substantiates fully the figures which the Senator from Washington has just quoted. In calculating families a most liberal interpretation of the word has been used by figuring any two or more people living in a dwelling as being a family, whether related or not.

In defining a dwelling I have for the purpose of this argument eliminated rooming houses, hotels, dormitories, trailers, light-housekeeping rooms, and so forth. To put the question in another way, the dwelling figures mean dwellings with utilities and facilities for private-family life. Several individual metropolitan areas are broken down and analyzed just preceding this table. These figures do not represent individual movements, but the exact over-all results. It should be borne in mind that these figures were compiled in April 1947. Since that time almost 2,000,000 new dwellings have been added. Since then the maldistribution has become greater and greater, and the spreading out of the people has continued day by day. These are nothing but hard-headed economic facts by which we have refused to be guided in recent years. I cannot get anyone to deny the validity of those figures.

Let us for a few minutes analyze some of these 34 metropolitan areas and see what happened in our larger American cities.

First. There was an increase of 2,582,000 families and there were 2,642,000 dwellings available to house them.

Second. Two million and eighteen thousand families obtained separate dwellings and 564,000 doubled up.

Third. All 2,018,000 extra families that obtained separate dwellings obtained them by purchase.

Fourth. There was an increase of only 105,000 rental dwellings but there was an increase of 188,000 rental units occupied by one person, so 83,000 families were squeezed out of their rental dwellings.

Mr. President, I am curious about something. The Senator from Washington thinks that not all, of course, but some Senators in leadership and authority ought to be on the floor of the Sen-

ate more often. The thought has just occurred to the Senator from Washington, though he expects to do nothing about it, at least for some time yet tonight. It ought to be mentioned that beginning tomorrow the Senator from Washington will attempt in a serious way to amend the bill, to offer amendments to it. It is one thing to be against the bill; I think it is proper at the same time to help to improve a bill, so that if it is finally passed, it is even, in the eyes of the critic, the best bill he thinks it could be made to be.

All afternoon I have had on my desk 10 or 12 legitimate amendments, none of which I have offered, because the Senator from Washington considers himself to be a pretty reasonable man. But I am beginning to wonder how many Senators are going to be in Washington tomorrow. As I understand the rules, every time the Senator from Washington or any other Senator sends an amendment to the desk, he can legitimately ask for a quorum. Perhaps tomorrow we will have, let us say, ten quorum calls, so far as the Senator from Washington is concerned. Perhaps there are other Senators who would like to try, on either side of the aisle, to amend the bill.

If the Senator from Washington were not so much interested in what he thinks is one of the biggest questions this Congress could ever decide, because even at this time of night the Senator from Washington retains a reasonable sense of humor, he would try a quorum call and see what would happen. I wonder what the chances would be of getting 49 Senators here. It might be a very healthy thing to try. The Senate has before it an important public question.

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

Mr. CAIN. The Senator will yield for a question, of course.

Mr. ECTON. Would the Senator be willing to yield so that the Senator from Montana may suggest the absence of a quorum? Then we will see what will happen.

Mr. CAIN. It is very generous of the Senator from Montana to make that offer. The Senator from Washington would resist it, because he wants to conclude what, in our parliamentary procedure, is known as the first speech of the Senator from Washington on the pending question. If the Senator from Montana or the Senator from Washington suggested the absence of a quorum, the Senator from Washington would lose his right to the floor, which does not mean that he would be prohibited from getting it back again; but he would rather continue for a while, in the interest of continuity. However, the Senator from Washington is grateful to the Senator from Montana for sharing his curiosity over what would happen. We are likely to try it a little later, perhaps at 12 o'clock.

The Senator from Washington does not know exactly what is happening to the Senate in recent days, and what happened before this rent control question came up. In the last 10 days or 2 weeks, because of the volume of other responsibilities, more and more Senators have been absent more and more often, per-

haps at home, perhaps in committee. I know the Senator from Washington often is. But are the few Senators on the floor now conscious of how long it has taken in recent days to get a quorum once the absence of a quorum has been suggested?

It is not for me to suggest how the majority leader ought to run his business, but somebody is going to get around to suggesting the absence of a quorum pretty soon; and the Senator from Washington is not kidding about that. I wonder where the Senators are to come from?

Mr. President, the fifth consideration involved in our analysis of these 34 metropolitan areas is that evidently most of the extra 564,000 couples who doubled up could not or did not care to buy dwellings because there were still 335,000 unoccupied dwellings—mostly for sale only.

Sixth. Six hundred and eighty-three thousand dwellings that were rented or vacant in 1940 had been sold and were now owner-occupied. In addition to these, 1,506,000 of the new 1,950,000 dwellings have been sold.

Seventh. There was an increase of 2,202,000 owner dwellings.

Eighth. There are 1,205,000 dwellings occupied by 1 person.

We are talking about a housing shortage, and we are going to try to prove how rent control created it through artificial means, approved and supported ever since by our kind of people in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I repeat, there are 1,205,000 dwellings occupied by 1 person. Nine hundred and two thousand of these are rental units. The average number of rooms per rental dwelling is four.

We would not have had a housing shortage in these 34 areas if rent control had not caused the following maldistribution, spreading out and hoarding, with 564,000 American couples doubled up.

This, Mr. President, is rather amazing:

| | |
|---|---------|
| Increase of rental dwellings occupied by only 1 person..... | 183,000 |
| Increase of owner dwellings occupied by only 1 person..... | 101,000 |
| Unoccupied dwellings (mostly for sale only)..... | 335,000 |
| Total dwellings..... | 624,000 |

From my point of view there is no real housing shortage in America. There has not been one, from my viewpoint, since 1947, because with 1,205,000 dwellings occupied by one person, and another 335,000 unoccupied dwellings, there can be no housing shortage in these 34 metropolitan areas. There are only 564,000 extra couples doubled up. By decontrolling the 902,000 rental units which are occupied by one person, there would obviously be affected, would there not, enough rental units to take care of all the extra couples doubled up if they desire to rent instead of buying any of the 335,000 unoccupied dwellings which are mostly for sale. These single persons could easily obtain private rooms or share small apartments, as they have always done before.

Perhaps the time has come in America when we no longer want to encourage Americans to do what they did before.

But if we once thought that on the average it was healthy in certain circumstances for Americans to share accommodations with other Americans, and if we still think that to be a proper thing to do when those persons so want to do, we can, if we only will, get rid of the artificiality which has been caused by rent control.

Let us now come back for a minute and note the two impressive figures used by the Housing Expediter and the other Government agencies to impress Congress at the 1948 hearings on rent control. Having been a Member of that Congress I can admit that it, the Congress, was impressed. The first figure was that of the 1,210,000 married couples who were doubled up in these 34 metropolitan areas. This is admittedly an impressive figure only when the balance of the figures is not observed. In 1940 there were 646,000 couples doubled up in these areas.

No one claims there was a housing shortage in 1940. Maybe somebody will claim it tonight, or before the debate is over, but no one ever claimed it in any of the rent-control hearings I have ever attended in 4 years as a Member of this body. We can safely conclude, I think, that there was not any housing shortage in 1940. The couples who were doubled up in 1940 were living with others, for many reasons of their own. Many were living with a widow or widower parent of one of the couples. The older people had large dwellings and needed companionship or care. That has always been true, has it not, in large cities throughout the history of America? Surely they were not doubled up in 1940 because of a housing shortage, because at that time there were 693,000 unoccupied dwellings in these 34 metropolitan areas, and nobody even thought of a housing shortage in that period. Housing was so plentiful and so cheap in 1940 that besides these 693,000 unoccupied dwellings in these 34 metropolitan areas there were 714,000 rental units or dwellings occupied by only one person.

When there was a great housing surplus there were 646,000 American couples living doubled up with others, not because they could not get the space to live apart, but because, for reasons of their own, they did not wish to live apart. Yet in the Banking and Currency Committee hearings on this subject of rent control one witness after another would come before that committee and testify that there was an alarming number of doubled-up married couples in America, and left the positive impression that we ought to be so situated that there would be not a single instance of a married couple being doubled up with another married couple.

In my own view that would not even be the millennium if it came true. It would be the result of a planned economy. It would be because of a determination by the American Government to claim to know more about how American couples want to live with and by each other than do those couples themselves. Obviously most married couples want to live by themselves, but I think there are substantial and understandable and good reasons why there are

thousands of exceptions to that general rule. In 1940, when anybody who had anything at all could get all the housing he wanted at a price he was willing to pay, there were 646,000 American couples doubled up with others. At least I think an acknowledgment of that fact is important.

The important and serious figure is the increase of 564,000 in couples doubled up between 1940 and 1947. Most of these couples in this increase actually desired, I think, to have separate dwellings, but were forced to double up. All these 564,000 couples would have obtained dwellings if it had not been for the maldistribution of space that took place. The dwellings would have been available for these married couples if rent controls had not created this great maldistribution and frozen them out.

Mr. President, please, sir, encourage any Member of the Senate to disprove these facts if they can at the conclusion of this debate. I think they cannot.

Even if the measure were to prevail and be passed, and I hope it will not be, if there is no disproving of these facts the Senator from Washington could sit back and laugh, and be sad, too, over the passage of a bill which was not justified by the facts.

The second figure used to impress Congress was the low figure of rental vacancies that existed in 1947 in these metropolitan areas, and I think Senators probably will hear more about that tomorrow, or on Monday, or Sunday, if we meet then, from the advocates of the bill. Those advocates, I think, Mr. President, have a great deal of time coming. They took 5 minutes on Wednesday—period.

I think the advocates of the bill ought to try their best, however inadequate, in my opinion, that will turn out to be, to disprove the economies we are putting into the record for, I think, the first time, since Federal rent controls became a national and controversial question in 1947.

I have already endeavored to show why almost no rental units can possibly exist vacant under rent control. But it is interesting to note that in 1947, in those 34 metropolitan areas, there were a total of 335,000 unoccupied dwellings, mostly for rent only. The average person in 1947, if asked to express an opinion about how many unoccupied units there might be or if asked to give his impression about that matter, would have replied, "Absolutely none." However, Mr. President, the Bureau of the Census advises us that there were a total of 335,000 of such unoccupied dwellings.

RENTAL UNITS BECAME OWNER HOMES

Prior to rent control, thousands of residential homes in all large cities were rental units. Every Member of the Senate knows that. When rents on those homes were frozen, it was not long before controls started to create shortages. Why was that, Mr. President? It was because the owners of those homes, after finding that they could not raise the rent, in a day in which everything else was going up, found it more profitable to sell their homes, rather than to rent them. That was only good sense, of

course. Individual homes were the one type of rental units that buyers could get possession of, and thus force out the renters. Hundreds of thousands of these rental homes were progressively sold and taken out of the rental market. Occupants renting them were evicted by the new buyer. This same buying by joint ownership of two- or three-unit apartment buildings also took many rental units out of the market. These units nearly always have a large number of rooms. In the past, these were rented to families with children. Mr. President, we remember that those units were largely rented to families with children. There must be a good, if distressing, reason why that practice has passed. Those units are usually located where there are ample yards and grounds, space for children to play and grow up in. The sale of these units is the principal reason why families with children are unable to find rental units today. Rent control has penalized our citizens of tomorrow by freezing out the children of today.

Goodness, Mr. President. In the name of doing something for people, in the name of liberalism, we have actually done them a great disservice. Let someone tell the junior Senator from Washington—and prove it, if he can—that that comment is not true.

We know that thousands of private and Government war rental housing units were built; nevertheless, we find that out of a total net increase of 2,307,000 occupied dwellings in these 34 metropolitan areas, 2,202,000 of them became occupied by purchase, while only 105,000 became occupied by rental.

Mr. President, for years in this country we have been asking ourselves, "Will building ever catch up with the demand?"—whereas behind our backs what we have done has resulted in actually eliminating housing units from the rental market in America faster than they were built, even with all the high-cost residential building that has been authorized and guaranteed by our Federal Government in recent years.

I think these things are true; that is why it takes time to make them available to other Senators. Certainly I never had an opportunity, when I came to grapple with this problem, to have any information like this. In the past we had to learn it; we had to suffer to get it; we had to travel all over the country to see what the situation regarding rent control actually was. None of this 105,000 increase of rental dwellings became occupied by families; in fact, 83,000 families were squeezed out of rental dwellings, because there was an increase of 188,000 rental dwellings occupied by only 1 person. Where did those 83,000 families go, when they were squeezed out as a result of the continuation of rent controls? I do not know where they went; you do not know, either, Mr. President. But they added to the hysteria which, existing in America, is responsible for a housing shortage, when they did not recognize, because they could not be informed about it, the nature of the problem. The mere existence of rent control made it more difficult for them to get places in which to live.

Mr. President, now I wish to say something in which I very definitely believe, but which I have found it more than casually difficult to convince those who, along with myself, are included in this particular category. I now refer to a subject for which I have the subhead—

VETERANS CHIEF SUFFERERS

Mr. President, the American veteran of the last war has turned out, in fact, to be the chief sufferer from Federal rent controls. I should like to speak to that subject for a few minutes. I hope that veterans who may be in the galleries here tonight or veterans who may read about this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if they do not think what I am about to say is so, will send me their views. However, if they will read these few observations, I think they will be very likely to agree that everything was not as it had been told to them—and for these reasons:

Mr. President, our veterans are the ones who suffered the most from Federal rent controls. For the most part, they have been greatly deceived and misled, although I do not say that has occurred intentionally. A good many million veterans of the United States—and I am saying this, Mr. President, as a Senator, and I am saying this to them, in my own full right tonight—actually were deceived and misled by Federal rent controls. While they were away, Mr. President, what happened? What happened was the most natural thing in the world. It could not have been avoided; but it ought to have been anticipated, and we ought to have run away from having that anticipation come true; we should have avoided that as soon as it was humanly possible to do so, after the war was over. I think that situation, Mr. President, is primarily why I became convinced in 1947 that the longer we had rent controls, the faster we went backward in this country, so far as the provision of adequate housing facilities was concerned, and the more we hurt the American veteran, although we in the Congress were telling him that our lives here in the Congress were devoted to the one cause of recognizing the great contributions made by the veterans. I do not think most Members of the Congress in years gone by knew they were misleading the veterans, although they certainly were, by means of the passage of measures extending Federal rent controls.

Mr. President, while the American veterans were away at war, those who stayed at home spread out and took over most of the homes and most of the rental space from which the American veteran had departed, on his way to far places. I think there is nothing wrong with that conclusion. When the veteran returned to this country, he could not have those rental housing units, even though the veterans were anxious to pay higher rents than were paid by the present occupants, who, on the average, have more space than they have ever had before. It is not that the average American should not have more space than he used to have a long time ago. They ought to have, provided they can pay for it, what they want—but on a competitive mar-

ket, not on the basis of buying with an inflated dollar what they are not entitled to, in terms of additional floor feet of space. But I am talking now to the veterans, of whom I happen to be one.

We have said to the average veteran, "You must buy or build a home at a false, high price." We have not wanted very often to tell him that the price was going to be high or false. We have simply indicated to him, "You will have to buy a home. The Government will assist you in doing it. Obligate yourself for years under a heavy mortgage." That is what we have been telling them all. Meanwhile, those who remained at home from the war are being protected by the Government in excess housing space at low rent. We have never told the veteran that. We should never have had to tell him that. We should have told the other people of America when the war was over that it was time for them in a reasonable way to shake themselves up and move over a little, in order that the veteran, when he returned, might have a place in which to live. We did not do that. No, we monkeyed around with a Government guaranty of mortgages. We jockeyed around with propositions by which we could help convince the veteran that he was probably getting something which did not cost him very much. We worked out arrangements to amortize the mortgage over a long period of time, and convinced many a veteran we were doing him a favor. We did him the greatest disfavor when we required him to do that, whatever the mortgage terms and however liberal, when we had it within our power to ask those Americans who remained at home during the war to be willing to undertake competitive conditions again when the war's end had been achieved, in order that the American veteran might have a right to compete, also, and find for himself a place in which to live.

Today there are great numbers of childless couples, widows, and others who would like to move into smaller units, but who cannot move. In a free market they would move into smaller units and make space for the larger families. Under our present system all are frozen where they are. Ah, we could probe that particular subject for a very long time. Most States did not impose rent controls. Mr. President, if we remove Federal rent controls what do you think would happen in this direction: How many Americans must there be who, if their rent was raised 10, 15, or 20 percent, would then decide to do what they had wanted to do along about 1941 to 1945, namely, build and own their own homes? It seems logical to the Senator from Washington that there would be literally thousands of such cases. How many people, Mr. President, do you know, possessed of adequate means with which to build a comfortable and convenient home, and who have not done so, but have preferred continuing to live in a rented accommodation for which they were paying with a 1950, 1948, or 1949 dollar at the 1941, 1942, or 1943 level?

The surest way by which we could have created a housing shortage was to

do exactly what we have done. We have violated all the natural responsibilities of men and women. We have imposed ceilings, while at the same time we have encouraged an ever-increasing family income. We have made squatters and permanent tenants of many Americans who years ago began to think in terms of home ownership. But why, in recent years, should such persons build houses for themselves, when they can secure adequate housing accommodations by having the Government insist, in many cases, that their landlords subsidize them, when such tenants often are possessed of much higher incomes than are the owners?

A few cities have had large increases in nonwhite population. Many of these nonwhite citizens moved from the South to the northern cities and now live in a more crowded condition than do the whites in these cities. The rent-control agencies and the social workers emphasize this particular phase in calling attention to crowded conditions. This increase in nonwhite population in the northern cities should have some explanation, so that the reader may analyze the whole problem fairly. At least we shall do our best to make the explanation clear.

FACTOR OF CONVENIENCE

These nonwhite citizens usually lived in the South in housing that was crowded and without city conveniences. In the North most of these people enjoy central heating, hot and cold water, toilets and plumbing facilities right within the living quarters, which they seldom enjoyed in the South.

Actually, by comparison, their housing is better in the North than it was in the South. These people are not crowded because of a shortage of money. They are making the highest salaries they have ever made and they have the money to have more housing if it were available. Rent control has caused the housing shortage and, therefore, they cannot expand into more housing. If rent controls were removed these people, as well as the white population, would have more space to live in. I believe this.

Removal of rent control will force those hoarding housing to move into the comparative space they can afford in a free market. This will produce a sufficient number of apartments to take care of all the present shortage. In many areas I think we created such a shortage by artificial means and that, when all the housing will have been restored to a free market, many a builder will lose everything he invested, because it is completely impossible to determine what the housing needs of a particular community are, so long as that community continues to bear the burden artificially created.

A free market will also bring forth thousands with ample means to buy or build, who now rent spacious quarters at a loss to the owner and the Nation. These are the people who should buy or build new homes, not the veterans or young newlyweds who definitely want rental housing units.

I happen to come from a section of the country which prides itself because of the high percentage of its citizens who own their own homes. But those home owners in the State of Washington, in years gone by, bought their homes and fought and suffered for them because they wanted to buy them. What a monumental difference there is between that situation and being forced to buy a home because one cannot find any other place in which to live. In recent years the more substantial people in America have not been the purchasers of homes in great quantities. We have forced the young married couple to buy them, and we have forced the veteran to do what he would generally not be in a position to do until he has been at work for 8 or 10 years. To restate it, out of the goodness of our well-intentioned hearts in recent years we have placed a mortgage of more than one kind over the heads and the pocket-books of millions of youngsters in this country who are just getting started on the road to married life or have just returned from a war overseas to find no place in which to live. So this gracious, liberal Government—indeed, it is liberal with other people's money—talks a young veteran into buying a house with a mortgage of \$14,000 on it, saying, "John, don't worry; we will amortize it over a long period of time. Your payments will be just like rent." That is the albatross that will sink John because, when he comes home some night and says to his wife "Listen, Bessie, we have an opportunity to go from Sacramento, Calif., to Birmingham, Ala.—a new job, a new chance, promotion, advancement," she, being a very cautious girl, says, "No, John; we have a mortgage on our home. You better stay here and try to pay it off." So he stays. The years go by, and there is the same age-old story of a man who could have been a success but became a failure. It will be repeated all over again, partly because the Government strangled his opportunity by continuing to impose Federal rent controls on a nation which ought to have had free competition beginning in 1947. At least, that is the view of the junior Senator from Washington.

I shall now pick out a startling case. A striking example of the fallacy and deception of rent control—and I use the word "deception" not in any vicious sense, but rent control, in my opinion, has actually and concretely fooled and deceived the American people, although I think very few of those who sought to impose it on the American people did so because of any vicious or sinister wish—a striking example of the fallacy and deception of rent control is the metropolitan area of the twin cities of Scranton and Wilkes-Barre, Pa. This large metropolitan area actually has lost population during the last 7 years. These twin cities had a number of vacancies in 1940, and even though they lost 15 percent of their population, over 93,000, during the last 7 years, they now have a serious housing shortage.

That is but one such example I could give. I could get pretty close to that mark in Chicago, which, with much building, and in 10 years an increase in population of almost zero, had great surpluses in 1940, but which successfully

achieved artificially a magnificent housing shortage in 1950.

Will some Senator stand up and tell me that those figures are cockeyed?

Let us return to the case in Pennsylvania. I have cited it because the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] will read the RECORD and may take exception to what I have said. What I meant to show, in using this example, was that in Scranton and Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in 1940, there was a housing surplus, and in 1947 the population was reduced by 15 percent, and by the time they got rid of 15 percent of the population they had achieved a first-class housing shortage.

The Senator from Washington is hopeful that some Senator, either on this side of the aisle or on the other side, will explain to him how it is possible to lose 15 percent of the population over a 7-year period and come out with a housing shortage, when we began with a housing surplus.

That happened in the State of Pennsylvania, and I have used that example, because in due time the whip on the other side of the aisle will, I hope, rise and say that the Senator from Washington is wrong, and endeavor to prove it, though I am satisfied he cannot prove it. So he will go on boosting for another year's extension of rent control.

Most persons know that we never before had a housing shortage in the United States. Prior to 1942, as I understand, under free competition, there never was a time that one could not go into any large city and find a choice of houses or apartments for rent for immediate occupancy. Sometimes the price was high, and sometimes it was low, but there was always rental housing available.

Our present shortage is artificially created by rent control. During the last 2 years we have built more individual dwellings and homes in the United States than in any similar period in our history. In nearly every large city in the United States, newspapers carry columns of advertisements offering thousands of homes of all sizes and descriptions for sale.

The Senator from Washington is constrained to believe that by the time he finishes his remarks most people will have concluded that it is the considered opinion of the junior Senator from Washington that our present so-called housing shortage has been artificially created by rent control.

The homes which are advertised are often vacant and ready for occupancy. Yet we have been talking about a housing shortage for years. What we really have is a shortage of rental units. We shall always have a shortage of \$5 bills being offered for \$3. We shall always have a shortage of 50-cents-on-the-dollar rental housing, which we have had from the minute we imposed Federal rent control. There is no shortage of houses for sale. Nearly all the frozen-out persons who could raise the money have bought houses. They had to buy them or sleep in the street. I have felt just as sorry for their predicament as has any other American citizen. Now each day houses are becoming harder and harder to sell.

This housing shortage created by law is causing untold maladjustments in our whole economy. Producers of building material, contractors, and labor are charging top prices, and profits, based on the seemingly unending demand which many do not know is false. Removal of rent control would slow down this false demand and create competition, thus greatly increasing the efficiency and decreasing the cost. This would greatly aid everyone who wants to build normal improvements or additions. The farmers and small-town people are now paying high prices because of the great demand for labor and material created by rent control.

The next subject in continuity is trying to fix the blame without criticizing the past. What we are trying to do is to get ready to do the best job we can in the future.

Before I take up that aspect of the case, Mr. President, let me say that I am again curious, as is everyone else, about some other activities. Earlier in the evening I had an edition of the Washington Star which told me that Ben Hogan was not doing so well at Ardmore, Pa., in the fiftieth showing of the national open golf championship tournament. Sam Snead had a little trouble. I think he had a 75 this afternoon. I am told that there is a morning newspaper available. I trust that no one will be very unhappy with me if I enjoy myself personally for a few minutes. For the better part of the past several hours I have been working at my trade in a very serious way. Now for a few minutes, and because it is close to a week end which I may not personally have a chance to enjoy, I want to carry myself and those who may be interested to Ardmore, Pa. Oh, I must stop for a minute. There is a story on the right-hand side of the newspaper on the front page which says:

Control foe holds Senate floor hours; LUCAS angry.

That may or may not be an understatement. I do not know. However, I want to go back to golf for a minute. Then we shall return to the subject to which we mostly keep our attention.

I am surprised. My goodness gracious.

An unknown yesterday by the name of Lee Mackey shot a 64. Today he shot 81. That means that from now on he will be unknown. Well, fame is short-lived in many ways. Senators who do not hanker after golf, as they say in the Pacific Northwest, will not know what a 64 on the first day of the national open must have meant to him. He was an unemployed golf pro. He got into the play-off in an elimination held in Birmingham, as I understand—a play-off for the last place. So he went to Ardmore, in Pennsylvania, where he had never been before, and the official committee, recognizing what was what, and so on, sent him out early in the morning. He did so well that no one watched anyone else in the afternoon. But that was yesterday. There are various ways in which one can get chilled off. Yesterday morning Mr. Mackey started at 8 o'clock. Today, because he had become a big shot overnight, they started him at 2:30. He

shot an 81. From 64, that is 17 strokes. It is too bad he did not shoot an 82, to be consistent, which is 18 strokes higher than he shot yesterday. What time they will start him tomorrow, I do not know. The chances are they will not let him play at all. Perhaps the majority leader and I may come to an agreement on this basis—that we both take off immediately to watch the 36 holes they are playing tomorrow.

The average man is becoming stronger and more agile in every way as time goes on. It used to be that when a man was 30 or 35 in practically any competitive activity he was an old man and all washed up. I am not speaking in defense of any Members of the United States Senate, including the Senator from Washington, but I do want to see what the newspaper says about E. J. (Dutch) Harrison. The majority leader probably has watched him play some fine competitive golf.

E. J. (Dutch) Harrison, the 40-year-old "Arkansas traveler," hummed his way—

"Hummed." That means he sang a little bit. I heard him do it—

around Merion Golf Club's 6,694 yards in 67 shots today to grab the lead in the second round of the national open championship with a 2-day total of 139.

My goodness, let us go back to Mackey. Yesterday Mackey led the tournament by three shots. Today he is behind the lead by six shots. In fact, he must have hit a lot of half shots today in Pennsylvania.

With well over half the big field in, the veteran who now plays out of St. Andrews Golf Club at Chicago held a big-looking, one-stroke advantage over the three players who were pushing him hardest.

I think there is a contradiction in that sentence. A one-stroke advantage, with three golfers looking over your shoulders. I would not feel very confident. The three golfers are Johnny Bulla, of Verona, Pa.; Jim Ferrier, of Chicago; and Julius Boros, of Southern Pines, N. C.

Bulla added a sizzling 64—four under par—to his 74 of yesterday, to leap into the thick of the competition as the title event continued under a searing sun. Ferrier's two rounds were 71-69, Boros', 68-72.

Right behind this trio, all by himself at 141, was little Ben Hogan, the accident-scarred gamester who perhaps was the most feared man in the field at this juncture after the cofavorites, Sammy Snead and Jimmy Demaret, virtually had shot themselves out of sight of \$4,000 first money.

This is an understatement. For a subtitle it says:

Mackey blows up.

I thought that was adequately covered in the headline. Why kill the man with another punch after he has been taken reasonably good care of at the outset? We had better follow him, human suffering being what it is among people in and out of public life, and see how he got into this catastrophic situation. I use "catastrophic" in its proper sense. Yesterday, when the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] used the word "catastrophic" in colloquy with me, when he referred to what results come from Federal rent control, I said, "Senator, I dissent. I do not think that is a proper

use of the word 'catastrophic.'" I hope the junior Senator from New York will agree with the junior Senator from Washington that when an unknown by the name of Mackey goes from 64 on one day, when he led 155 of the best players in America, to 81 the next day, when he probably shot himself completely out of the tournament, it certainly is catastrophic so far as Mr. Mackey is concerned. However, let us read this and then get back to work.

Lee Mackey, Jr., the unknown sensation—

Today he is just unknown—

from Birmingham, Ala., who set a tournament and course record yesterday with a 64—

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

Mr. CAIN. The Senator would be pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wonder if the Senator will tell us what the headline says.

Mr. CAIN. What headline?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The headline in the newspaper.

Mr. CAIN. I think that would be a little improper. It happens to refer to the Senator from Washington. [Laughter.] I was deeply enjoying myself until my friend raised that question. I was talking about a very normal activity. I am going back to read that quietly when I have a chance. It says, in substance, that there has been no vote on S. 3181 as of this minute. [Laughter.] That is not literally what it says, but that is actually what it means.

The newspaper goes on to say that Mr. Mackey "blew up under the pressure today and carded a 40-41-81 for a total of 145. Young Mackey with most of the 10,000 fans at his heels, could do nothing right today. Yesterday he could not do anything wrong."

I wonder if any one of us has ever been pursued by 10,000 people who were intent on watching us in a very close race. I have the greatest possible sympathy for the unknown Mr. Mackey, from somewhere in Alabama, who went to his first golf tournament and was the leader the first day, and did not have 10 people in his gallery, but when he became good, 10,000 people came out to see him win or die; and he must have died a thousand deaths today.

I think I have taken enough time to satisfy my own personal wishes, but I do not want this newspaper to get far away. There is much more in it, covering tragedy and success. Competitive golf, outside of competitive politics, I think is the most vigorous, exhausting, and demanding game in all the world.

Mr. President, probably the most damaging effect of rent control on our whole country has been the general acceptance by so many American citizens, including many of our top leaders, of the idea that free competitive practices cannot cure this artificial housing shortage. Thus they are willing to accept public housing as a cure.

Have many Senators stopped often to think about the relationship between what is known as public housing and what is known as Federal rent controls? I hope the patience of my colleagues will

permit them to listen for a little while to my interpretation, anyway.

Many people do not recognize the terrible curse of public housing in any country. They do not know that it is the Communist's utmost desire. The American people did not even know what public housing meant until after rent control caused the great false housing shortage and the present confusion. Rent control is truly the father of public housing, the fallacies of which are to be given later.

We have shown by actual Government figures and explanation as to how and why the shortage came about and how it can be cured, but we have not dwelt on many other factors of the housing problem. In the following paragraphs we will present other facts and figures on housing and rent control which have seldom had any publicity. Certainly they have not been very much talked about on the floor of the Senate since first I came here in 1947.

Judges, bankers, editors, industrialists, legislators, clergymen, and even owners of rental property themselves, have been greatly fooled by this false housing shortage which has prevailed in America in recent years.

I was reminded of that as being a fact on the occasion a night or two ago when a great many first-class citizens at the Westchester had a meeting of indignation over the wish of the management to turn the facility into a cooperative. That meeting was evidence of the fact that the people who attended, among the finest citizens there are in Washington, D. C., were almost entirely concerned with their own problem of shelter and not with the question of how it comes about that the Westchester is being offered to us as a cooperative by its management. The people who ought to have been studying and understanding this question, from my point of view, have all too seldom done so.

The American people have been educated and raised under the competitive free-enterprise system. They have never had the opportunity to calculate the evils, confusions, and maladjustments caused by a controlled economy. It is likely, however, that they are going to be given a first-rate chance to understand some of these evils in the days to come, if we decide in June 1950, to extend federalized rent control.

The American people have previously drawn their conclusion on shortages from careful observation. In a competitive free-enterprise system, this usually gave them the correct answer, not always, but usually. Under a controlled economy, many things happen that cannot always be calculated until after the effects have taken place. We have seen this in the recent shortage of butter, coffee, sugar, and so forth.

The false housing shortage has come about in much the same manner as the shortages of the other items. However, it has been more confusing and it has taken us a little longer to find out how it happened. There was one group who were not deceived by this false housing shortage. They are our top economists. These men proclaimed that the very things that happened, would happen, and

that the people would not be able to understand and would believe they had a true housing shortage.

PLAIN EVIDENCE ABROAD

These economists did not have to depend entirely on their reasoning power. They had a perfect example in the European housing situation, where rent control began with the First World War. Rent control, as I said several hours ago, has never been taken off in France and in other places abroad. Each year, by normal observation, the people thought that they had a housing shortage. In a very short time, the Socialistic-minded leaders convinced the people it could not be cured by free enterprise. We hear that being prattled about these days times without number.

The only cure, said such leaders, was public housing. That was the answer to the whole problem, they said. This is always a big step toward totalitarian government. It might be said that perhaps in this country we can adopt methods that have been pursued by others without moving in the direction in which others move. I very much doubt that, but we know that public housing, and the way in which it is now coming into being in this country, is no different in direction from what has happened in totalitarian states abroad. One of the principal edicts of the Marx manifesto was that the government should control housing. By controlling housing, it is easy to control the people. How easy that has been in recent years.

There is not a Senator, I suppose, who has not received letters by the hundreds in recent years which include protests from Americans over how they have been mishandled and mismanaged by the Office of the Housing Expediter. And what is that? A Federal agency controlling the lives and the rights of private citizens.

Today a large percentage of our citizens believe the housing shortage is real. They are almost convinced that free and competitive enterprise cannot cure it. So they become that much easier victims for public housing propaganda. These people have not checked the records of public housing. They do not know that it does little it claims to do. They are not aware that public housing contains within it the substance of pure statism or socialism. Public housing almost invariably is the result of housing shortages created by rent control.

Rent control was presented and inaugurated in this country as an emergency war measure. Most people patriotically accepted it as such—a temporary war-emergency measure. It was to keep rent from soaring in war-industry centers where great increases in population took place. Congress quickly passed this law as an emergency war measure, but at that time instructed rental-control directors to freeze rents only when they became speculative and inflationary in character.

I wonder if most Members of the Senate and of the House remember that the OPA was cautioned at the time it was established by an act of Congress not to be too hasty or anxious to exercise its authority to impose controls on rents?

How often has it happened in the short time the Senator from Washington has been a Member of this body that the Congress has passed a law the intent of which was one thing and the administration of which became quite another thing? So it was in this field of Federal rent controls; and probably 8 out of 10 Senators, or 9 out of 10, have completely forgotten that the Congress ever cautioned the control experts to take it easy and go slow.

In a very short time the bureaucrats made it almost Nation-wide, regardless of war industries, abnormal increases of rents, or population. Having some authority they exercised all of it. And because the Congress does not have a police force to watch what goes on with respect to the legislation it passes, and because the Congress is constantly plagued by pressing problems, it did not know how its intent was being violated.

Today some people wonder if rent controls were not actually a scheme of leftists in our Government actually to change the economy of the Nation. I have not looked at it in that way myself. The Senator from Washington is of the opinion that once a law has been created which includes within it new powers, those who administer that law like to exercise such power, and one securing the powers they seek to keep them always.

By way of proof of that conviction, without any personal reference to any of these people, the question may be asked, How many agents of the Housing Expediter has any Member of the Senate ever heard say, "I am going soon to be able to close up my job and to return my whole office staff to private life and private competition?" Senators never hear them say it.

This compromise rent-control measure came not from the Congress which represents the people. It came, I am told, and I think I could establish that to be a fact, first from a meeting held in the office of the Housing Expediter, a meeting held out of desperation and fear and with the pretty sound knowledge that the chances were that pretty soon the Housing Expediter and all his satellites would either be returned to private life or taken on by some other Government agency come June 30 of this year.

It is perhaps just as well to recapitulate by saying that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] who sits on my left, the whip of the Democratic Party, was a cosponsor with the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] of what was known as the administration bill. That bill was offered to the committee. It was finally voted down by a score of 9 to 3. It represented a 1-year extension. We are not talking about a 1-year extension now. We are talking about a compromise which was designed to be the sugar to catch the bumblebees on both sides of the aisle. At least that is my view.

No one seems to know who some of the real authors of this Rent-Control Act are. But we do know in a real way they were not elected legislators who drew the

bill. If we check some of the top people who directed rent control in Washington, we find that they were persons who believed in a controlled economy. That is all right so far as the Senator from Washington is concerned; every person in this country is entitled to his own view. However, I think a majority of the Members of Congress do not agree with or support or intend to approve a planned economy, of which continuing Federal rent controls would be a strong foundation stone. Some of those who first administered Federal rent controls knew that they would create confusion and misunderstanding that would make the people believe that they had a real housing shortage. Such persons had the records and experience gained in Europe. They did the job so well that they fooled many of our national legislators, and eventually got them very close to accepting public housing as a cure.

PERPETUATE THEIR JOBS

In recent years we find groups of people working for the Government in our rent-control offices. These people are paid by taxpayers for controlling other people's business. They spend large amounts of Government money to issue propaganda booklets and press and radio reports to perpetuate themselves in control. The more housing confusion they create—the longer their jobs last. Mr. President, that is literally so.

I must look to see whether I have a copy of the Tighe Woods radio broadcast. If so, I must get it and use it fairly soon, because I am reminded of the fact that, quite by accident, I ran across a radio script which the Housing Expediter gave over some radio station—I suppose our memorandum has the information as to which radio station. In that radio message or broadcast he used a number of what I suppose are known in the profession as "tear jerkers." I wish to read that broadcast to those who are here, who may be interested in it because their money paid for it. I can take it sentence by sentence; and, if people are concerned, from it they would develop sufficient charges of irresponsibility against the Housing Expediter to keep him busy straightening them out for the rest of his life. I wish to get it, particularly because I went to the trouble of spending a little of the money of the junior Senator from Washington to find out to what extent the Housing Expediter had told the truth. I was distressed that either he or whoever made up that monkey business did not know how to tell the truth, apparently. Nevertheless, the information was passed out over national radio programs, with the intent of intimidating and misleading his listeners. The pity of the thing is that the Housing Expediter, in himself, is a lovable character, a fellow who often wears a yellow vest with black squares on it. It is not often that we find an American who can wear a vest of that character and be accepted freely among all people. Some persons might be thought queer if they wore such a vest—but not the Housing Expediter. People like him when they know him. I have known him for quite a length of time. As a matter of fact, I was recently in

Chicago, the city from which the Housing Expediter came. I went around and talked to a number of those who used to employ him—employ him; he did not employ them. However, there is no point in trying to rib someone unmercifully. We simply ought to know better what we do in this country.

At any rate, I am fond of the Housing Expediter. I suppose the record indicates that I had more to do with getting him his job than did all the other Members of this body put together, because at the time when the Federal Housing Expediter's nomination came up for confirmation, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee placed the subject in the hands of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rents—who happened to be the Senator from Washington. I had a great many conversations with the intended Housing Expediter. He told me what things he hoped to do. I am not even qualified at this late date to say that he has not tried to do his best. What I must say, however, is that his best has not been good enough, for seemingly he has not been able to control and manage the activities of many of his agents.

Mr. President, I think the Federal rent-control law is one of the most deceptive and malignant laws ever perpetrated on the American people. It has already been established by a number of us that we thought it was a proper thing to do—if an unfortunate thing to do—during wartime. In 1947, we lost our willingness to support a law which is evil in itself, basically. To those of us who feel as I do, Federal rent control is practically a delusion, insofar as it will achieve the ambitions its proponents have for it.

To say that a continuing Federal rent-control law is un-American is, to me, an understatement of the truth.

Federal rent control has in part and in particular instances created a police-state atmosphere, insofar as concerns those Americans caught in its web and trap.

Federal rent control is, in fact, as I have said earlier today, communistic in essence, although I am not maintaining that those who support this law have any part of socialism or communism about them. However, we ought to remember that any communistic nation could do no less than we have done in regulating, through Federal channels, the private property rights of our citizens generally.

Federal rent control has frozen veterans out of housing and has robbed them of their savings money.

Federal rent control has turned class against class.

Federal rent control is creating slums throughout our country.

Federal rent control has cheated many of those who want to rent, because it will not provide them with an opportunity to rent.

Federal rent control has robbed the property owner.

Federal rent control has seriously injured free, competitive enterprise.

Federal rent control has increased the inflationary spiral.

Federal rent control has created an army—if a small one—of Federal bu-

reaucrats, and it has killed State rights—or, at least, I think it has.

Federal rent control takes away the liberty and freedom of both renter and owner. Mr. President, most persons who want to get rid of rent control say, "My goodness gracious, you are curtailing the rights of the owners." However, Mr. President, Federal rent control hurts the renters, as well, because it has frozen them in the quarters they now occupy, and in recent years they have had no choice as to where to live.

Federal rent control has driven into our Constitution a dagger which I think we can take out, if we want to do it and if we recognize the sin of what we have done.

Federal rent control has made crooks, thieves, sneaks, and liars out of both owners and renters who formerly had been good American citizens.

Federal rent control has opened up an avenue of graft through bureaucrats who control rents, and it is breaking down the moral fiber of our American citizens. Mr. President, there is no doubt about that. People are doing business all the time under the table. In my office we receive many letters complaining about such matters, and when we track them down, we find them to be true; for instance, a tenant wants to pay more rent because he recognizes that the rent should go up, and that if it does go up he will get some improvements in which he is interested. So, under certain circumstances, he is willing to pay \$50 a month more rent. However, that is against the law written by the Congress and administered by the Office of the Housing Expediter.

We have told American citizens they cannot do what we know to be a reasonable thing for them to do; so they do it anyway. And, once having cheated their Government and gotten away with it, they are likely to get into the habit of cheating each other as individuals. In that case, the fat really will be in the fire.

Rent controls have deceived the American people, or misled them—I like that word better—into believing they have a real housing shortage when, as a matter of fact, the American people have more housing relative to population than they have ever had before.

HAS DECEIVED THE NATION

Our citizens act as if they were plagued with opiates. Millions of normally fair-minded honest citizens are asking for something that they would quickly reject if they knew the facts, or at least I so believe. Leaders in all fields are now loudly voicing their opposition to any totalitarian form of government. Yet, the ironic thing is that many of these same men and women who are against anything totalitarian advocate and vote for Federal rent controls. Eight million owners of rental property are to be controlled, but all other Americans are to have their freedom. Other Senators can go along with that conclusion if they want to, but not the Senator from Washington. I know of many other Senators who feel as I do. It is sad to think that many free-enterprise leaders, who benefit from bargain housing under rent controls, are willing to

jeopardize our whole free system for a little cheaper rent. If 8,000,000 property owners lose their freedom, others will lose theirs also in the not too far future. Rent control is the real father of public housing, which is actually the fondest dream of those who would like to communize our Nation.

RENT CONTROL IS A DELUSION

We ought to destroy this law before it destroys our free competitive system. The American citizen enjoys almost four times as much housing space as does the English citizen under socialism, and almost ten times as much space as the Russian under communism. Why should this great country, with the finest housing in the world, whatever its faults may be, find itself in a chaotic confusion, caused by a rent-control law? When its perpetrators first proposed this law, they said it would protect people from skyrocketing rents in war industry centers, where they expected great increases in population during the war.

History shows that some of these persons had no such intention but rather a plan for the complete control of all rental housing in the United States. Once the law was passed, bureaucrats immediately started to list and regiment the renters and owners of rental property in every important town and city in the country. The records show that it was the most firmly held control of all. Nearly every other product that was put under control was allowed to rise in price whenever justification of an increased cost could be shown. In the case of rental property, it was held tight and fast, regardless of the increase in cost. Every type of argument was used to hold it firm. Owners were told that injustices and inequities could be expected in time of war and that nothing could be done about it. So far as I know, nearly all Americans went along with that premise.

HOME BUYERS PENALIZED

A large group of renters did save money under rent control, but think of the great increase in cost to all who did not have rent-control protection. The veterans, the newly married couples, and those who were squeezed out were forced to buy houses at an excessive price, although most of such persons wanted to rent. All that was done was to protect some at the expense of others. Today, all are frozen in or out, and we surely are following in this field of Federal rent control the European trend of collectivism.

Rent control is, in a way, a delusion. It has created chaos and confusion. Chaos and confusion do not result from the removal of rent controls. The very existence of the controls itself creates the chaos. A good leftist would know it would be the natural result, anyway. Such persons hope that we in the Congress will blame free and competitive enterprise for the housing shortage, and thus will accept public housing as the cure. Public housing is the cure. I think the Senator from Washington is on sound ground in making that observation.

VETERANS WERE CHEATED

Under rent control veterans have been deceived and ill-treated. When they re-

turned they were told that there were no rental units for them because of the great shortage. Few of them knew anything about housing or economics, or that this purported housing shortage was artificially created. It was, however, very real. They were told to buy new homes. How many veterans do we know who had to buy new homes because they could not find a place for rent? I am merely trying to tell such a man tonight—and I hope he believes me—why he could not find a home for rent, and why some of us who served with him have been voting against an extension of rent controls in order to protect him—the veteran—ever since we came to this body in 1947. And some of us have taken that action despite the fact that some veterans' organizations, professionalized generally, adopt resolutions in favor of the continuance of Federal rent control. There are some veterans among those who serve in the United States Congress, who have studied this question over a long period of time, as sincerely and as thoughtfully as they could, and who are convinced that nothing more injurious was ever done to the rights of free American veterans than to continue the imposition of rent controls on the country after the veterans returned from fighting fronts all over the world, to find that the continuance of such controls froze them out of the accommodations they had willingly left several years before. After the veteran was told to buy a new home, he did so. These homes were sold at extremely high prices and financed with large mortgages, over a long period of years. The veteran now finds himself living in a home that he did not want, usually far away from transportation and convenience. He actually desired to rent one of the units which is occupied by a single person who stayed home from war.

The Government protects these people in spacious rental units, in many instances far larger than they need or ever used before. Veterans, on the average, would much prefer to pay higher rent than the protected people are paying. They would be better off economically today paying more than the frozen rent.

For example, take any large city where a modern apartment is frozen at \$50. These apartments have all the conveniences of transportation, stores, schools, churches, and the like.

Thousands of these apartments were taken over by single persons in every large city while the veterans were at war. Today over 2,000,000 rental apartments are now occupied by one person. These single persons are hoarding housing with Government protection, while the veteran is forced to buy. At the rate we have been building, it would take untold years to build 2,000,000 rental apartments. If controls were removed and the rent rose to \$75 on these apartments, instead of the present \$50, many single people would move into rooms in private homes or share their occupancy with some other person. The veteran would be better off to pay \$75 rent for these apartments than to indebted himself on a \$10,000 to \$12,000 home far from transportation and other conveniences. This unwanted home will cost at least \$100

a month to live in. It will use up his small capital or Government loan that he should save for an emergency.

The Senator from Washington takes it for granted that many an American veteran will not believe the logic which I am offering or that which I have offered, but, fortunately, when they have a chance to read it, many an American veteran will read what I have stated and, first, by instinct and then by study, he will determine it to be the truth. From that time on he will not be concerned, I think, with criticizing those who thrust him out of a home and forced him to buy another home he could not afford, through the medium of Federal rent controls, and he will, I think and hope, insist that future Congresses make no such fundamental mistake in the event we shall encounter any emergency in the days ahead.

During the war all of us were very patriotic. I remember the days of the parades, the flags, the bands, and the martial atmosphere. The Senator from Washington spent about half the war in a public office, where he led the cheering section. The other half of the war he spent, by force of circumstances, in the service, five or six thousand miles away from the State of Washington. As a result of that first experience, bond drives, wounded and disabled soldiers returning from overseas, sailors, marines, and Air Corps people, we used to turn out the honor guard. We would take pictures of them; we would put the veterans in Cadillacs and ride them down the main street. We said to them, "Boys, if your Nation has not been grateful in the past, it is certainly going to be grateful in the future. The first thing we want to give you is the key to the city." It turned out that that was the last thing we gave many of them, and the keys we gave them to American cities did not fit any of the doors. They tried them. I can speak tonight as both a public official who used to tell the men things which were not true, and as a man who came home to find they were not true.

That, in part, answers some questions posed to me from time to time as to why I oppose rent controls with such vehemence. I feel that we in America have unintentionally deceived, confused, and robbed a great many veterans under the guise of Federal rent control.

When one of these \$50-frozen-rental apartments is vacated, the veteran has practically no chance to get it. The black market raises its ugly head and stops the veteran from moving in.

The daily newspapers carry columns of advertisements offering new cars below list price, and other items with a high retail sales value, to anyone who will furnish one of these rent-frozen apartments. Any owner with a vacancy can stay within the law and gain from \$400 to \$900 profit by giving his apartment to someone who offers these salable items at low prices. Thus again, the veteran has little chance and is a victim of rent control.

People without wealth or influence are the people who need rental units most. People with wealth or influence can afford to buy. When a rental unit becomes

vacant today, those who need it cannot get it because those with wealth or influence can pay the owner twofold for a bargain rent-controlled unit. They can always find a way within the law. Those that need rental units the most will never get them. They will be forced to buy.

Much has been said and written about the Government financing cooperative apartments for the veterans. Here again, we are deceiving and robbing them. Why should veterans join together on new cooperative apartment buildings which will cost them from \$2,500 to \$3,000 a room when they can buy fine modern apartment buildings already built and well located for \$1,200 or \$1,500 a room. The answer is—they can buy these buildings but they cannot get possession, ever though every apartment in the building they buy may be occupied by one person. Here the rent-control law says occupancy is ownership, for low rent, regardless of who puts up the money to buy a building.

The veterans must build at double the cost of what they could buy a building because even if they buy a building they cannot obtain possession.

We have done a lot of good things for the American veteran. We have tried to do good things for him even in the field of rent control, but in the field of federalized rent control we have done him a disservice from which he will not be able financially to recover for years, if ever, and we have actually, because we are continuing up to date the Federal rent-control law, bankrupted the financial opportunities of many young men.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished Senator if he will yield, and I am asking that he yield without prejudicing his rights to the floor in any way, so that I may present an inquiry to him and also to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Washington yielding without losing his rights to the floor? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the Senator's courtesy twice during his discourse in yielding for a brief recess. I am going to ask him again, if it meets with the approval of the majority leader, if he will agree to yield once more in order that we might see if there is a possibility of working out some arrangement whereby a vote might be taken on the bill?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Illinois under the same conditions?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 10 minutes in order that the able Senator from Nebraska and other Senators may confer, with the understanding that the Senator from

Washington shall not lose any of his parliamentary rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 11 o'clock p. m.) took a recess for 10 minutes.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate (at 11 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) reassembled.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Illinois had not made such a request, nor has any other Senator, so I assume the Senator from Washington will proceed.

Mr. President, when the brief, and to me unexpected, recess was called, the Senator from Washington was making a few reflections on the subject of the veterans, a subject very close to the heart of the Senator from Washington, and likewise to the heart of the present occupant of the Chair, the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. That is not to say that the Senator from Washington and the Senator from California look at this problem of the veteran in the same way, though very well we might, but it goes without saying that each of us will do all he can, in the way he thinks best, to give the veteran all the legitimate help and assistance to which we consider him to be entitled.

If I remember the record—and in dealing with a problem like this, one studies it very carefully—my mind tells me that the junior Senator from California, for example, voted in 1947 and 1948 for the extension of Federal rent controls, while the Senator from Washington was voting no; but I think that the Senator from California and the Senator from Washington joined hands with a few other Senators in 1949 in voting "no."

To return to the subject, Mr. President, few veterans with whom I have had an opportunity to talk, or few veterans before I had a chance to talk with them, had actually understood how they had been deceived, if unintentionally, by those in their Congress and in their Government who insisted on the continuance and extension of Federal rent control.

Many American veterans today think that rent control is good for their own best interests. They do not realize how it has actually cheated and robbed them of opportunities.

Rent control takes away the rights of American citizens to enter freely into contracts between themselves. It injects into their private business a bureaucrat who dictates all the terms of the contract. It takes private property without just compensation. This is one of the prime privileges granted by the Constitution—the right to enjoy one's private property. It tends to make crooks, liars, and thieves out of good American citizens, both owners and tenants, and opens up an avenue of graft among bureaucrats who operate it. It is truly un-American.

CLASS AGAINST CLASS

Never before in this country have owners and renters been propagandized to feel that they are two different classes and enemies of each other. The use of taxpayers' money for propaganda, encouraging renters to demand subsidies from owners, is one of the greatest ills that can befall our Nation. In all history there has seldom been such antagonism as now exists. The true history of relationship between owner and renter shows the owner has usually been the renter's partner. That was true in many and most of the decades in the history of this country's development and progress and building. I hope it becomes true again. I think it has more nearly become true in the past 15 months in the eight American States which have been removed from the supervision of Federal rent controls.

Earlier in the evening the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], wondered how his friend Henry Picard was getting along in the tournament. Apparently he is still out on the course. At least the newspaper I looked at an hour ago did not have any reference to Mr. Picard.

When the honest renter was in trouble the owner was in trouble with him. There are millions of American owners who have gone along for months without full rent because they knew their honest renter was in trouble.

All of us know how many times that was true in the depression years of the 1930's. All this good feeling between tenants and owners, American citizens all, has been held in serious jeopardy in recent years under the continuance of Federal rent control.

Today many an owner cannot make money on his property and the renter is being constantly urged to protect his rent-control rights. We have moved so far in a strange foreign direction that 2 nights ago it was possible, in our ancient Capital, for a group of Americans, most distinguished citizens, living in the fine place which I call home while I live in Washington, the Westchester, to meet—I have to keep coming back to this amazing situation—for the purpose of protesting the right of the owner of that rental facility to do with it what he liked.

The Senator from Washington, with knowledge of that meeting in the Westchester the other night, and being a fairly rational man, can only conclude that it might be hopeless to try to lead any fight against the further extension

of rent controls. The Senator from Washington, if he thought that most of America's upper 10 percent, or leading citizens, as represented by those who live in the Westchester, have arrived at a considered opinion that they, who have no vested interest in private property which belongs to somebody else, still have today a right to tell those whose capital is invested in that property how to use it, then what would be the use of assuming that the bulk of citizens less well informed and less well educated than the so-called leaders of America could be made to understand how the continuance of Federal rent controls would jeopardize, crucify, destroy, and eventually despoil and besmirch their right to freedom?

What could be worse than the class hatred developed under Federal rent control? No longer can the owner and the landlord freely and in a friendly way get together on any discussion of rent or any other important housing problem. Every move must be checked by a Federal bureaucrat. Of course, such bureaucrats can only survive by confusion. They make certain that propaganda keeps turning the renter against the owner. Rent control, Mr. President, puts Government in control of housing.

It is said now, "The Government has no intention of controlling housing in this country. We are only going to extend it for another 6 months." I think most people are serious when they say, "Let us accept this compromise. It is only 6 months more of something we know to be evil, but we can easily put up with another 6 months more of it." That is not the point. Anything which represents tyranny and oppression must not by free men and women be permitted to survive for a single day beyond any opportunity to destroy it, to kill it. At least the Senator from Washington is of that opinion.

Karl Marx's Communist theory was that Government must control housing and thereby control the people. It has frozen owners and tenants so that neither can move. This Nation is far from being Russia, but is not the extension of rent control for reasons which are unjustified a characteristic which we would expect to find in Communist Russia? Those that are frozen out because of rent controls must build or buy new dwellings they do not want. Most of such dwellings must be financed, as they have been financed in recent years, by a Government guaranty. Thus, a Federal Government, however well intentioned—and I am satisfied ours is, though I oppose it for the most part politically—gets closer and closer to a complete control of all housing. This Government of ours, with our help, and we, the Congress—supposed to be the last best hope of mankind—have created a false housing shortage and so deceived the American people that they are ready in great numbers to accept public housing as the cure.

Let us see—and it will not take long—who wants public housing and what it really is and does. The Senator from Washington would be for public housing if he thought it was a real answer to anything. The Senator from Washing-

ton knows it not to be a fundamental answer to anything because a demand for public housing results entirely from an artificial shortage of rental accommodations caused by the continuance of a Federal rent-control law.

As the Senator from Washington has said repeatedly during the course of this day, public housing to his mind is the child—I would say what sort of a child if I thought it was a proper term to be used—of rent control. I think I would approach the word I have in mind by saying that as a child of rent control public housing has no legitimate name. Its forefathers came from Europe. Many good things have come from Europe—many bad things, too. In Europe in less than 35 years public housing has built slums and even demoralized many people. Today a few clever Communists and leftists hope to lead us to that end, in addition to which in the Senate of the United States some, and quite a number of the finest men I know in this body, the finest Americans, by the way, have led themselves into a conviction that public housing is a necessity.

The omnibus public housing bill which was passed some months ago by the Senate was partly sponsored by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. No other Senator could think more highly of the Senator from Ohio than do I, or disagree with him more positively in his conviction that public housing, as provided in that omnibus bill, was a necessity for the American people. I would have to say to the senior Senator from Ohio, and to many other Senators, that there is something wrong with that public housing bill. It has not been accepted quite so generously, quite so freely, quite so spontaneously, and automatically by the American people as was the intention of its sponsors and those who voted so overwhelmingly for it.

The Senator from Washington is inclined to remember that only 12 Senators voted against the final passage of the bill. Maybe the 12 of us who dissented were wrong. We do not think we were. I remember that the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] joined with the Senator from Washington in offering an amendment to that public housing bill which said, in effect, "If we are going to pass it let us provide through an amendment for a referendum in every American city." We thought it proper then, and know it to be so tonight, that before the Federal Congress imposed a new venture known as public housing on the communities of this land the people ought to be so respected that they would be given an opportunity to express their own point of view.

I cannot remember at this time of night how many cities have had referendums on the question, but what I know at any time of day or night is that no cities have held a referendum because the Congress of the United States helped the city or cities to secure it. We took pains, because the amendment was defeated, though 21 Senators voted for it, to make certain that there would be no referendums in those States which by State statute prohibit or do not pro-

vide for referendums. I have just been advised by a member of my staff that referendums on the public housing question have been held in 16 American cities in the past year, and in 15 cases, when the people voted, they voted against accepting what the Congress of the United States offered to them as seemingly a gratuitous gift which the hard-headed common sense of normal American citizens knew that somebody would have to pay for, and those cities, having greater wisdom than do we, living as we sometimes think too close to the fever of the Potomac River, knew that moneys to be appropriated for the fostering of public housing throughout the land could be used to better and more beneficial effect in other ways.

Those who hope to have the Federal Government take over all housing eventually are, to my mind, few in number today; but they have spread their doctrine fairly well. They are dangerous because many persons believe that we can have an economy controlled by bureaucrats, a so-called planned economy, planned by bureaucrats, while at the same time we keep our personal freedom. Mr. President, I believe that no such thing can occur in a representative form of government.

Before I forget it, inasmuch as I mentioned it a minute ago, let me say that I am reminded that in a recent referendum vote in the city of Seattle, a very liberal-minded city, 85,000 American citizens went to the polls and voted; and, by a vote of better than 2 to 1, as I recall, they turned down what on the surface looked like a gift for which no one would have to pay. The question was whether the city of Seattle would accept from the Federal Government approximately 2,000 units of Federal housing. The answer was, "No."

Mr. President, it was last week, I believe, that in the city of Portland, Oreg., a referendum was held, resulting from the determination of American citizens to be heard, after the Congress has said, "We shall not let you be heard." I think the question there was in regard to 1,000 or 1,500 units of public housing. The free citizens of Portland, Oreg., voted "No."

Mr. President, I have forgotten the name of the gentleman—but he is closely associated with the so-called housing group in Washington—who went to Portland, Oreg., to watch the developments of that campaign. When the campaign had been waged and the vote had been taken and the public-housing issue had been defeated, that gentleman returned to those with whom he is associated in Washington, D. C.; and he is reported to have said at a meeting on the subject, "You know, our side did everything we could possibly do. Our propaganda was first-rate. Our people worked hard. Yet we lost. How could that be?"

Mr. President, the explanation of how it could be is that there are still a great many American citizens who know, because they were brought up in a school of simple reality, that people do not get something for nothing, and that a Federal Government which promises one community something which costs some-

thing must provide that cost by taking it from other American citizens. Yet, Mr. President, we in the Congress, we in the Senate, thought we knew all the answers; and we thought that all we had to do was pass a public housing bill, and the line would form on the right, and every American citizen would rush to the public trough. However, in 15 cases out of 16, the attempt has failed.

I wonder whether most of those people, who are average Americans, such as those who sit in the galleries this morning or this afternoon or tonight, believe that the Congress was right or that those who live in the grass roots were right. I will forever feel privileged to have had a brief opportunity to sit in what is, in fact, the greatest deliberative body in the world; and I shall continue to place my reliance, not on some types of legislation which are conceived in a vacuum, but in the hard-headed, common-sense decisions which are arrived at by the very best American families, who live in the hinterlands all over the Nation.

Mr. President, the few leaders in America who seek to have the Federal Government eventually control housing, because they know the control of housing controls people, are fully conscious of the fact that Federal rent controls, or, in fact, any other kind of rent controls, will continue to accelerate the creation of an artificial housing shortage. They know the people will not understand why competitive enterprise cannot cure it. They feel sure they can fool and can confuse our legislators; and I think generally their assumption is much more often correct than it is wrong. When our legislators became confused over a developing housing shortage because of their belief that something had to be done somehow, they themselves began a clamor for public housing in the United States.

Mr. President, public housing is paid for with the taxpayers' money. It is politically built and politically operated. Party workers often buy the land, let the contracts, fix the rents, and choose the tenants. Does anyone believe that friends or appointees of politicians, spending other people's money, can do this job as cheaply or as efficiently as it can be done by individuals using their own money? The records prove that in the former case the cost is generally much higher.

MEANS LESS HOUSING

Mr. President, for the past several hours, or even longer, I have been discussing the situation as it developed between the years 1940 and 1947. In 1947 the building industry was working at its peak, in what we call—although we do not understand it, in many cases—free or competitive enterprise. Thus any public housing built in that period would presumably reduce private building by at least the same amount. Actually I think we got less building, certainly not more. The Government would have to outbid private builders for both labor and material. Under public housing, we often—and usually—get less housing, but at a greater cost.

I have nothing personally against one who often is referred to as a bureaucrat. Mr. President, a bureaucrat can be very inefficient or he can be very efficient. He can be very smart or he can be very dumb. He is, in a very large majority of cases, an American who has one great weakness; namely, a bureaucrat, by the very nature of his job, does not have to be responsible to himself for whatever waste of property, or time or money or energy he may be responsible for. The bureaucrat operates with things which do not belong to him. He is nothing more nor less than a trustee for someone else's assets. It is simply human nature that when one does not have to pay for his mistakes, he does not work so hard as he otherwise would to avoid mistakes. I have a reasonable concern over the growing size of the Federal Government—not because it is managed by a Democratic administration and because the Senator from Washington belongs to a different political party, but because as the Federal Government increases in number of personnel, it merely adds to the number of those who work with, and supposedly take care of, things which do not belong to them. The risk is too great. The inducements to people to do other than a thoroughly competent job while on the payroll of the Federal Government are too numerous. It goes without saying that the smaller the personnel needed to manage the people's business, the better that business will be managed and the greater the care that will be taken of the taxpayer's dollar. Certainly the men and women of America have given, in an amazingly free and patriotic way, to their Government.

How many dwellings shall be built? The bureaucrats refused to recognize that wages are at their highest peak and that unemployment is almost nil. They say that people cannot pay higher rents than they did in 1940, although their incomes are almost double and even more than that.

Mr. President, how do you account for a contradictory statement of that sort? If they were able to pay X for rent in 1940, with B as the income, could they not reasonably well afford to pay X plus something when the income was B plus 2? The junior Senator from Washington makes no claim to having either a retentive memory or to being very sharp, at this hour of the evening, but it tickles him that he actually could make that equation come out right, so that it will look and be correct on paper when it appears in the RECORD.

By 1947, building costs had more than doubled; and people paid more for everything else, did they not? Yet we, in the Congress, and others in the Federal Government, referring particularly to the managers of the Office of the Housing Expediter, said that with \$2 or \$3 for every \$1 the people had in 1940, it would be inhuman to take a little bit more of that additional income for rent. In 1947, I did not think that the attitude of those who held that position was necessarily un-American; I merely thought it did not make sense; but the Senator from Washington has learned a good deal about this question in years gone by.

There are about 8,000,000 units of property under rent control. There are not that many at this time, in fact, because a good many have been released. But whatever the number was, or is, or may be, of owners of property under control, there will always be a larger number of tenants living in those facilities.

In years gone by I have known public officials who convinced me that they thought it was proper—and from their point of view I suppose it was—to vote on public questions purely on the basis of the number of letters received for and against a proposition. They merely counted the letters, which made life very simple. If a larger number of people wrote favoring a subsidy than wrote opposing it, such a legislator as I have in mind would favor the subsidy. It is not for the Senator from Washington to criticize that legislator, but, if he be interested merely in numbers, it necessarily follows that he must always, so long as he lives, vote in favor of rent control, because there will always be more renters than there are of those who make facilities available for others to rent. Thus, with public housing, everyone who pays an income tax will subsidize a public housing tenant. That may be right. The Senator from Washington thinks it is wrong.

Now, let us consider for a moment how many dwellings the bureaucrats will have to build.

AN IMPOSSIBLE GOAL

I was thoroughly familiar with this phase of the problem because I was given a good course of sprouts or of indoctrination when, as an uninitiated Senator, I first became a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and served as such for a short time in 1947. Witnesses came before the committee who talked like this: "We will build for low-income families. In Chicago it is to be those with annual incomes of \$2,150 or less. To be fair to all such families in the country, that would mean only 12,000,000 housing units."

I think the omnibus housing bill included a provision for 810,000. We start these programs in a very modest way, but if the people of America, through their community referendum votes, continue to turn down the offer of the omnibus public-housing bill to provide them with accommodations, I do not know what we are eventually going to do. I understand those who are interested in fostering the public-housing program, if not indignant, are at least very sad and very much worried. Unless they are able to give away everything the bill calls for, in order that they may come back to us and ask for more, it might come to pass in due time that there will not be any need for them to continue working for the Federal Government. That would be a great pity—a very distressing situation for those involved. It is likely to come to that because the American people are again beginning to sit up and take notice. They are rather coming around to the opinion that the war is over, and they are going to act accordingly. If they do not get a Congress that acts accordingly, they are going to start to make their own kind of Congress.

That is a great thing about America. We have an election coming up in November. The Chief Executive—without prejudice of any kind toward him—has recently made a relatively short tour of the country, during which he was encouraging everyone to give him a Congress that would pass laws offering to give more communities more public housing which, according to the record up to date, more communities could reject. As a Republican, I suppose I should say, in order to be fair, I do not see what sort of sense that would make. The 12,000,000 housing units, to accommodate those with incomes of \$2,150 or less a year, will only cost in the future—if that is the direction we are going to take—\$150,000,000,000 before we get through; and, if we were serious in trying to place all the people with incomes of \$2,150 a year or less in public housing, it would take all the labor and material that could be supplied in America for a decade, even if we stopped all other housing construction. Many of these assumptions will not come true, but there is a high degree of truth in everything I have said.

In Baltimore the intention was to start with a limit of \$2,950. In the State of New York there are always more important problems, it seems to me, than there are anywhere else; anyway, the problems are always more costly. What we will do for people in Chicago with incomes of \$2,150 we will do in New York for people with incomes of \$3,000. But I wonder if it would be fair to give people with incomes of \$3,000 new, half-free rental housing and bar taxpayers receiving incomes of \$3,100 to \$3,500. Where does the whole thing end? I think this has a direct relationship to the pending bill, because we all ought to be willing to agree that the less public housing we need the better, and if there is anything to the case being offered by the Senator from Washington that a demand has developed in front of our eyes because of the continuance of rent control, let us get rid of Federal rent control which will lead us in the direction of minimizing the need for additional public housing.

Are the bureaucrats clever enough to set a point where the renter is barred from public housing? At what point does he stop getting partially free rent? Would it not be better for the renter to work less and make less in order to benefit from half-free-rent housing? I think many an American who is not motivated by a strong urge of ambition inculcated in him by his parents or by solid education will, in the direction in which we seem to be moving, that of public housing, continue to decide the question in this way: "The less I work, the better off I shall be, because my Federal Government is placing an inducement before me if I make \$2,150 or less, or, in New York, \$3,000 or less, or, in Baltimore, \$2,500 or less."

If these housing units could be built by private owners they would cost a minimum of \$10,000 each. If built by public-housing contractors they would probably cost more.

What shall we say about the millions of farmers, small-town people and city

people who have worked and saved for years to pay for a home far less costly and far less modern than these new public-housing units? Shall we tax these fine American citizens who are proud of the little home they have bought and paid for, in order to give others, who have not sacrificed and saved, better housing at half the proper rent. Why should not all frugal middle-class citizens also have public housing?

The Senator from Washington cannot answer the question. Perhaps the answer to the question is that in due time all middle-class citizens with limited incomes of \$3,000 or possibly higher incomes will be accommodated by public housing; but if they are, I wonder what will happen to the thing called incentive, the desire of the average American human being to make of himself or herself a self-reliant, successful American citizen?

In the opinion of the Senator from Washington, public housing ought to be made available to those Americans who, for one reason or another, cannot take care of themselves. I have said in the past what I think and wish shall not come true, that after the 810,000 units of public housing authorized, I think, in the Eightieth Congress or in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, are completed, very few of the units—and please do not forget that—will be lived in by Americans who cannot take care of themselves.

That question has been raised and argued in the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and many very honest legislators and witnesses for the Government have said that of course the welfare case and the relief case will not be taken care of. Being naive, the Senator from Washington would say, "Why not?" The answer would be, "They cannot pay enough rent in order that the bonds can be paid off in due time." I have said, "Who can afford to pay enough rent, even admitting it is subsidized?" The answer invariably was, "Not those to whom you refer, Senator." The Senator from Washington would still probe it a little bit and inquire, "Does that mean that after we have 10,000 units of public housing every community is still confronted with a relief and welfare public-housing problem for those who cannot house themselves?" The answer has been a very blithe "Yes."

That is some of the information we have picked up in the course of 4 years.

We are fortunate, Mr. President, in having records of several public-housing ventures to prove how it works out. All this information was dug up through research in 1947. During the depression in the 1930's we engaged in several public-housing ventures. The people were not told they were public-housing projects; they were told they were being built to make work for unemployed building mechanics. During the war they were called war housing ventures. Later on they were called veterans' housing ventures. Now the bureaucrats are bolder and they call them housing for the lower-middle-income groups. Self-respect is a magnificent thing.

If the lower-middle-income group is going to be required to be taken care of

by the Federal Government, the time is not far off when there will be no one left to take care of the Federal Government. Actually it is all socialized housing camouflaged by another name. If we approve of it, let us be bold enough to say so.

Mr. President, public housing has always been accompanied by propaganda for slum clearance. In the first law ever passed by the Congress of the United States in relation to public housing—the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was here at that time—it was insisted that for every new unit of public housing erected one unit of slum housing must be torn down. I am relating history 13 years too late. Everyone was agreed. So the public-housers went into the byways of America, even to Tacoma, Wash., and said, "Mr. Mayor, here is the situation. This is good stuff. We help you and you help yourself. If you want 500 units of public housing we will give it to you. You assume an obligation for tearing down 500 houses in slum clearance."

If the program ever made any sense, it made sense in 1937. I thought the program made a lot of sense, because everyone wants to do away with slums. But the record is beginning to be pretty clear that there is no direct connection between slum clearance and public housing. Public housing has not thus far done away with the slums. It has not taken care of the people living in slums. Not 10 percent of the people living in slums got public housing. Who got public housing? The clever party workers of the middle class, of whom 30 to 40 percent have incomes far above the standards set as the minimum income for public-housing ventures. This was in 1947. The cry then was, "They must not be turned out, because you know we have a housing shortage." They did not pay any more rent in subsidized accommodations. They would rush back to Congress and plead with us and we would think up another amendment real quick, and then they would sit back and enjoy the free ride from then on.

In New York, in 1947, families with incomes of \$3,900 were eligible to stay in public housing. In Chicago, in 1947, a large number of public-housing tenants had annual incomes of from \$4,000 to \$12,000 a year. They got along quite well at someone else's expense. I think anyone who is sincerely and conscientiously interested in the question of Federal rent control and public housing will want to know a little bit more about the development of the assumptions on which public housing was approved. The basic assumption was that it would do away with the slums of America.

A few short months ago the Congress of the United States passed an omnibus public-housing bill. If I remember correctly, it went through the Senate of the United States first, and again two Senators who are called very conservative and sometimes reactionary, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the junior Senator from Washington, offered an amendment to the bill. Mr. President, do you know what it was? The amendment was to restore in the bill of

1948 or 1949 what had been thought to be a very reasonable provision in the original bill of 1937, which was that when the 810,000 units of public housing authorized in this latest—I would say—monstrosity had been erected America at least would have the satisfaction of knowing that 810,000 units of slum dwellings had been destroyed.

The Senate of the United States—and every Senator has a right to his own vote and conviction and position—said, "Oh, no, that will gum up the works. This is a modern age. We must move rapidly. We will take care of building public housing on the one hand, and we will take care of the problem of tearing down slums on the other." We will be so busy trying to build public housing that we will never again have time, I am afraid, to be very serious about tearing down the slums.

Mr. President, I realize, certainly, that it is becoming rather late. I think generally it may be agreed by all except the prejudiced—and there must always be some of those—that the Senator from Washington has tried at least to do a competent job of sticking to the subject of why the bill before the Senate, S. 3181, should not be approved. I am presently engaged in relating as tightly as I can the subject of Federal rent controls, or any other kind of rent controls, as a matter of fact, as to public housing. There is much more to be said on the subject. The Senator from Washington is constrained to be interested in making some further observations, perhaps real quicklike, on this subject. For the minute, however, he wants to go back to where he began early this morning with a reference to the prayers of the late Peter Marshall, the great Scotsman. My goodness, we all remember the twirl and twang of that man's brogue. Where he sits tonight, I may have embarrassed him a little bit, unintentionally, by taking so very long to say what Peter Marshall could have better said, through his prayer on Tuesday, June 18, 1948:

O Lord our God, deliver us from the fear of what might happen and give us the grace to enjoy what now is and to keep striving after what ought to be. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes a. m., Saturday, June 10). The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

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

| | | |
|----------|----------------|--------------|
| Brewster | Hayden | McClellan |
| Bridges | Hoey | McFarland |
| Cain | Holland | Morse |
| Douglas | Humphrey | Neely |
| Dworshak | Johnson, Colo. | Sparkman |
| Eaton | Kerr | Thomas, Utah |
| Ellender | Knowland | Wherry |
| Frear | Lehman | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MYERS, Mr.

RUSSELL, and Mr. THYE answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it is not debatable.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is a question in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A question is not in order. The Sergeant at Arms has been directed to produce enough Senators to secure a quorum, and nothing is in order until we secure one.

The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. WITHERS, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. WATKINS entered the Chamber, and answered to their names.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I inquire what was the last order made?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The last order was that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. We have spent almost 2 hours, Mr. President, getting about 15 Senators. May I inquire how many more we have to get?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two more are needed.

Mr. NEELY. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. MALONE entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator rise?

Mr. KNOWLAND. To make a motion to adjourn. Under rule V—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator need not read the rule. The motion is in order. It is not debatable. The question is on the motion to adjourn. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. KNOWLAND and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed by the President as a congress-

sional adviser to the United States delegation at the fifth session of the general conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization now being held in Florence, Italy.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, attending the sessions of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland, as a delegate representing the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the UNESCO Conference at Florence, Italy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—13

| | | |
|-------------|----------|-------------|
| Bridges | Knowland | Saltonstall |
| Cordon | Malone | Thye |
| Dworshak | Millikin | Watkins |
| Ecton | Morse | |
| Hendrickson | Mundt | |

NAYS—33

| | | |
|-----------|----------------|--------------|
| Chapman | Johnson, Colo. | Magnuson |
| Douglas | Johnson, Tex. | Maybank |
| Ellender | Kefauver | Myers |
| Frear | Kerr | Neely |
| Fulbright | Kilgore | O'Mahoney |
| Gillette | Lehman | Pepper |
| Hayden | Lucas | Russell |
| Hill | McCarran | Sparkman |
| Hoev | McClellan | Stennis |
| Holland | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Humphrey | McMahon | Withers |

NOT VOTING—50

| | | |
|----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aiken | George | Murray |
| Anderson | Graham | O'Connor |
| Benton | Green | Robertson |
| Brewster | Gurney | Schoeppel |
| Bricker | Hickenlooper | Smith, Maine |
| Butler | Hunt | Smith, N. J. |
| Byrd | Ives | Taft |
| Cain | Jenner | Taylor |
| Capehart | Johnston, S. C. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Chavez | Kem | Tobey |
| Connally | Langer | Tydings |
| Darby | Leahy | Vandenberg |
| Donnell | Lodge | Wherry |
| Downey | Long | Wiley |
| Eastland | McCarthy | Williams |
| Ferguson | McKellar | Young |
| Flanders | Martin | |

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is almost 2 o'clock, and I wish to make an appeal to Senators on both sides of the aisle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is still no quorum present. The roll call on the motion to adjourn did not develop a quorum, and one has not been developed on the point of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What does the roll call show as to the total number of Senators present?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are 46. No business can be transacted. There was one Senator lacking to make a quorum before the motion to adjourn was made.

Mr. NEELY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEELY. How many Senators have answered the quorum call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-eight Senators answered. Then a motion to adjourn was made, and 46 Senators answered. The Senate is bound by the last roll call. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] has now come in, making 47 Senators.

Mr. NEELY. During a roll call to develop a quorum, after a Senator has answered but fails to answer in the vote on a motion to adjourn—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Three Senators who answered to the roll call for a quorum did not vote on the motion to adjourn. The Chair knows no remedy for that situation. But if two more Senators come in who did not vote on the motion to adjourn their presence will be noted for a quorum.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, what are the names of the Senators who did not answer the quorum call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll call will show. The Chair is not in a position to answer the question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I dislike very much to demand the extreme penalty with respect to getting a quorum, but three Senators who responded on the quorum call apparently left for home after they answered to their names. Mr. President, we must do some business before we quit. I dislike to do what I am about to do, but if we cannot get the three Senators back here, or three other Senators, to make a quorum, I shall move that the Sergeant at Arms arrest the Senators who are absent. I shall make another motion that Senators who are absent be compelled to return to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion has already been adopted, and the Sergeant at Arms is in process of compelling their attendance.

Mr. LUCAS. So that there may be no misunderstanding, let me say that the Senator from Nebraska was recorded as being present on the quorum call.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order. I think it is perfectly proper that a motion be made under the rule to bring in absent Senators, and to bring in all absent Senators, but I make the point of order that it is not proper under these circumstances to concentrate on any one or two or three absent Senators. The Sergeant at Arms must bring in all of them.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall take care of that situation the way I see it, with all due deference and respect to my good friend from California.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEELY. The clerk informs me that since the first quorum call began 51 Senators in all have answered to their names. I submit that because 49 Senators were not present when the yeas and nays were called on the motion to adjourn does not nullify the fact that more than a quorum have answered during the quorum call and the yea-and-nay vote, and that a quorum is present within the contemplation of the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no way of determining whether on both roll calls 49 Senators answered, but under the rules and precedents the Senate is bound by the roll call on a motion to adjourn. The fact that other Senators voted on a quorum call and then left, in the Chair's opinion, does not make it possible to add their names to the number of those voting on the motion to adjourn.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel the attendance of the absent Senators; that warrants for the arrest of all Senators not sick or excused be issued under the signature of the Presiding Officer and attested by the Secretary, and that such warrants be executed without delay.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed by the President as a congressional adviser to the United States delegation at the fifth session of the general conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization now being held in Florence, Italy.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, attending the sessions of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland, as a delegate representing the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate for the

purpose of attending the UNESCO Conference at Florence, Italy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—29

| | | |
|-----------|----------------|--------------|
| Chapman | Johnson, Colo. | Magnuson |
| Douglas | Johnson, Tex. | Maybank |
| Ellender | Kefauver | Morse |
| Fear | Kerr | Myers |
| Fulbright | Kilgore | Neely |
| Gillette | Lehman | O'Mahoney |
| Hayden | Lucas | Pepper |
| Hill | McCarran | Sparkman |
| Hoey | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Humphrey | McMahon | |

NAYS—15

| | | |
|-------------|----------|-------------|
| Bridges | Holland | Mundt |
| Cordon | Jenner | Saltonstall |
| Dworschak | Knowland | Stennis |
| Eaton | Malone | Thye |
| Hendrickson | Millikin | Watkins |

NOT VOTING—51

| | | |
|----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Alken | George | O'Connor |
| Anderson | Graham | Robertson |
| Benton | Green | Russell |
| Brewster | Gurney | Schoeppel |
| Bricker | Hickenlooper | Smith, Maine |
| Butler | Hunt | Smith, N. J. |
| Byrd | Ives | Taft |
| Cain | Johnston, S. C. | Taylor |
| Capehart | Kem | Thomas, Okla. |
| Chavez | Langer | Tobey |
| Connally | Leahy | Tydings |
| Darby | Lodge | Vandenberg |
| Donnell | Long | Wherry |
| Downey | McCarthy | Wiley |
| Eastland | Mckellar | Williams |
| Ferguson | Martin | Withers |
| Flanders | Murray | Young |

VOTING PRESENT—1

McClellan

So Mr. LUCAS' motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion having been agreed to, the Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry. I do not know that it is a parliamentary inquiry; but I should like to know the last time when Senators were arrested, if the RECORD would show.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it was 1942.

Mr. MAYBANK. It so happens that I was one arrested in 1942, along with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

After a little delay, Mr. WITHERS, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. GEORGE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes a. m.). A quorum is present.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is now 15 minutes to 3 o'clock on Saturday

morning. We have been debating since yesterday morning. I regret that. Obviously I regret that we had to issue all the orders we did with respect to obtaining the presence of Senators. It was the last thing I desired to do.

I regret to find that at least two of the Senators on the other side of the aisle who answered the quorum call, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], were not here when the vote was taken on the motion to adjourn. They were the two Senators apparently most interested in continuing this debate.

Mr. President, this is an important question. This is an emergency piece of legislation. I have done everything within my power to grant to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle an opportunity to vote upon this measure at any time on which they would agree; it made no difference to me when, if they would but name the date. Senators well know, and the Vice President well knows, that I asked unanimous consent to vote on this bill and the amendments or any other motions, on Monday next, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday, or a week from Monday; and I could not get a unanimous agreement to vote.

There was some question as to whether I said we were going to have a night session, and whether we were going to terminate the session around 11 o'clock. My remarks may be interpreted any way anyone desires; but I have read them, and the record of the remarks definitely shows that the Senator from Illinois said that if any Senator desired to continue the debate, he would stay here for the rest of the night, or words to that effect, if necessary. It is not my desire, Mr. President, to punish any Senator with a view to keeping him up at a late hour, but I believe, and I think that those on this side of the aisle are of the definite opinion, that the proposition we made this afternoon was more than fair and more than reasonable.

I want to say, Mr. President, that if any Senator on this side of the aisle should seek to carry on a one-man filibuster, as the Senator from Washington did this afternoon, he would not have the protection of the majority leader of the United States Senate. He would carry it upon his own responsibility. If he could get other Senators to go along with him, that would be one thing; but he would not have the majority leader agreeing with him on a proposition of that kind and preventing the Senate of the United States from voting upon a vital proposition such as that of rent control.

I know, Mr. President, that practically every Senator on the other side of the aisle with whom I have talked—and I think they were in good faith—wanted to vote upon the rent-control bill. One of those most interested in the rent-control bill is the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. He is on the committee. He is against the bill. I talked with him at least two or three times during the day. He was anxious to vote upon this measure. Other Senators on the other side of the aisle were anxious to vote; but, because one Senator desired

not to vote, other Senators saw fit to protect him. That was their right, Mr. President. But I repeat, as majority leader of the United States Senate, under similar circumstances, I shall not protect a Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the acting minority leader, I should merely like to say, first, that the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is now in the Senate Chamber again. He went home earlier with a temperature. He has had a bad cold. He went home at the urging of the Senator from California and other Senators who knew that he was here with a temperature and a bad cold. I wanted to say that, because I think the Record should be perfectly clear as to that situation.

I also want to say that I personally had been very hopeful that we might be able to vote on this bill today. But we have rules in the Senate, which can be taken advantage of, quite properly I think, by both sides of the aisle and by individual Senators, without regard to partisanship.

After all, this is an important bill. The present law does not expire until the end of the month. We are not up against the gun of an immediate deadline. The pending bill has only been debated 1 day. It went over a day because on yesterday we took up the calendar and the entire day was spent on the calendar, and there has been a day's debate today on the pending measure. It seems to me that is not unreasonable under the circumstances. The majority leader at any time could have had an agreement that there would be a motion to recommit, to be made on Monday and that a vote would be taken on it as early as 12:30 or 1 o'clock; or perhaps, if we met at 11 on Monday, by 12 o'clock we could at least have gotten that motion out of the way.

While it is true that we cannot this morning—for it is now 12 minutes of 3 a. m.—get an agreement to vote also on the bill, it is my personal opinion—and I only express it as my personal opinion—that if we could get the motion to recommit out of the way, without too much difficulty or too much additional delay we could get some kind of agreement at that time.

I think we must always keep in mind that many unanimous-consent agreements will have to be reached between now and adjournment, and I think, with a little give-and-take and cooperation on both sides of the aisle, we shall facilitate the business of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment, please.

I do not altogether disagree with the Senator from California. The only thing the Senator from Illinois desires to reiterate is the fact that I offered, with the support of every Senator on this side of the aisle, any kind of terms which would finally bring the Senate to a vote. It does seem to me, Mr. President, that under those circumstances there should

have been a meeting of the minds between the majority and the minority.

I know the Senator from Nebraska has been ill, and perhaps I should not have said what I did a moment ago, that he was absent after the quorum call. He has been ill, and probably should not be present at this time, but it seems to me that we have lost something in the United States Senate because of our failure to reach some kind of an agreement to vote upon a question of this kind. I have never before known of an instance, when I had offered the opposition an opportunity to write its own ticket, that we could not reach some kind of an agreement.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I only want to say that I shall never be one to vote to shut off debate. But with reference to recommitting the bill, let me say that the committee held lengthy hearings and approved the bill by a vote of 8 to 5. The FEPC bill was a bill on which no hearings were held. I hope that my good friend the minority leader will not insist on recommitting the bill, because then we should have to hold hearings all over again. The Committee on Banking and Currency has plenty of work to do in the interest of the American people.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the majority leader for this opportunity of at least defending myself. I have not heard all that the majority leader said. I am surprised that anyone would question the cooperation and the loyalty of the junior Senator from Nebraska. In that respect I will put my record up against that of any Senator in the Chamber. The majority leader knows full well that I have been busy all day long trying to get a unanimous-consent agreement. Just before I left—and he knew I was going—I told him that the only thing about which I was concerned was not the fact that we had not been able to reach an agreement at that time, but that early today I asked the majority leader the direct question as to whether there would be an all-night session. Some Senator had told me that the record was "fuzzy" on that question. The majority leader said there would not be an all-night session. That fact was made known to the Senator from Ohio and other Senators, and I wanted to keep faith with those Senators, and they left upon my own recommendation. That recommendation was based on the statement, in answer to the direct question, the majority leader made that there would be no all-night session. Of course, the majority leader did say that he would remain until the early morning hours if any Senator wanted to speak. I suppose he is going to rely upon some of the colloquy in which we engaged, but he knows that I said to the Senators who wanted to leave that they might go. He knew that as well as I did.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not know anything of the kind.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not yield to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. But I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I am yielding to the Senator from Nebraska. But I do not know anything about what the Senator told other Senators. The Senator cannot challenge my integrity.

Mr. WHERRY. I am challenging exactly what the majority leader said.

Mr. LUCAS. The record will speak for itself.

Mr. WHERRY. He said there would be no all-night session, and on his word I let Senators go. I am not talking about an early morning session; the Senator said there would be no all-night session. That is why the Senators left. I think I have a perfect right, as the minority leader, to rely upon the statement of the majority leader that there would be no all-night session. Therefore, Senators were permitted to go to keep their respective engagements.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President. The record speaks for itself. I had hoped that the Senate would recess until tomorrow, return tomorrow, and then the Senator from Illinois could announce at that time that he would keep the Senate in continuous session. That would be agreeable to me, and no Senator would cooperate with the majority leader any more than I would to bring the bill to a vote upon those terms and conditions. That is the exact record. That is the colloquy I had with the majority leader. I think I am the last Senator on this side of the aisle about whom he should complain because of being absent on the last two roll calls, in view of the statement I made and the cooperation he has had from me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have a right to complain about the Senator from Nebraska, if I so desire, so long as I do so in accordance with the rules of the Senate. I merely stated that the Senator left the Chamber and he knew we were trying to obtain a quorum. In the meantime, there was a motion to adjourn and the Senator from Nebraska was absent. I understand he has been slightly under the weather, and I do not hold against him the fact that he left under those circumstances.

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

Mr. LUCAS. In a moment.

The Senator from Nebraska can interpret the statement in any way he desires, but when he tells me that I knew he told a certain Senator certain things, let me say that I do not follow the Senator around listening to conversations he has with other Senators as to whether they should stay or should go. The truth of the matter is that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is making such a strong plea for a vote, could be here on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, or a week from Monday, under the proposal which I made. Why does not the Senator lay the responsibility at the door of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], where it belongs, instead of trying to lay it on the doorstep of the Senator from Illinois?

Here is what was stated in the colloquy to which the Senator has referred:

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that we shall have an all-night session tonight?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not mean that we shall have an all-night session, to be perfectly frank. We shall probably stay here until 10 or 11 o'clock. So long as Senators want to talk about rent control the Senator from Illinois will stay with them. If they want to continue to talk into the morning the Senator from Illinois will stay with them.

I claim that the fair interpretation of that would be that we could stay here all night if we wanted to, or until the wee hours of the morning. If the Senator from Nebraska told other Senators they might leave, I cannot be responsible for that. The point is that those Senators are not here now.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that during the early part of the debate this afternoon the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] stated to the majority leader that he expected that at about 5 o'clock he would make a motion to recommit?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not also a fact that a number of Senators remained, expecting that motion to be made in order that they might vote?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly. Not only that, but we were told that there was a possibility that we would have a chance to come to an agreement. The Senator from Illinois had not only one, but three, unanimous-consent requests in mind in order that we might reach an agreement. The Senator from Washington himself advised the Senate that there was a possibility that we would vote on a motion to recommit around 5 o'clock in the afternoon. The commitment he made was much stronger than that which the Senator from Illinois made with respect to staying here until 12 o'clock tonight.

Mr. President, I shall make the unanimous-consent request again. I ask that the vote on the bill, all amendments thereto, and all motions at 4 o'clock on Monday, the time on Monday to be controlled by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and that no amendments be offered to the bill which are not germane.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from Nebraska substitutes his unanimous-consent request as an amendment to one made by the minority leader, that the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to recommit the bill at 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon, the time between 12 and 4 o'clock to be divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, did the Senator from Illinois provide that only germane amendments be offered?

Mr. LUCAS. I did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no motion pending to recommit. There would have to be something in the nature

of a request that the vote on such a motion, if it is made—

Mr. WHERRY. I would include in the substitute that the motion to be made will be made, and upon that condition the vote be had on Monday afternoon at 4 o'clock.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we get right back to where we were. That motion is debatable, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a unanimous-consent request. The first request was made by the Senator from Illinois, and it was to vote on Monday at 4 o'clock, and the request included a vote on the bill, and all amendments and motions. The Chair must put that request first.

Mr. WHERRY. May I amend by striking out a part of it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A unanimous-consent request is not subject to amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Do I understand that all unanimous-consent requests are not subject to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They are not subject to amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Are they subject to negotiation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator who makes a unanimous-consent request accepts a modification suggested by another Senator, it may be put in that form.

Mr. WHERRY. I must have used the wrong word. Reserving the right to object, I now ask to modify the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Illinois by providing that a motion be made to recommit, and that the motion to recommit be set for a vote at 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon, the time to be divided as I have already suggested.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not accept that modification.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. The Senator from Nebraska may ask the Senator from Illinois if he will modify his original request. The original request, if he does not modify it, must be put. It is subject to objection, of course.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the majority leader well knows that if I am to keep faith with Senators who are interested in the pending legislation it is impossible for me to agree to the unanimous-consent request at this time. He knows that. Regardless of what he says about the junior Senator from Nebraska, I shall protect Senators who are interested. Of course, the Senator from Ohio can come back and vote next Monday. That is not the problem. In the absence of a unanimous-consent agreement the majority leader is attempting to force the Senate to vote upon a measure which has been debated for only 2 days. There is not a Senator who will not agree with me that vote should not be forced upon those who have a right to be heard, that debate should not be cut off, and that those who want to vote should be given an opportunity to vote.

I have been waiting patiently for practically all this session of Congress to get a vote on basing-point legislation. I have cooperated with the distinguished majority leader in helping to get a vote on FEPC legislation about which he has been talking from time to time. I have been as tolerant as anyone could be.

I ask all Senators if they do not think that granting only 2 days' debate on this measure and forcing us to vote tonight, if we do not agree to the unanimous-consent request, is absolutely cutting off debate. I do not think the majority leader wants to do that, but that is what it results in. If we do not agree to a unanimous-consent request, he wants to stay here all night and vote on this measure, when the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is in Ohio and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has gone to see his daughter. Other Senators who want to vote on the bill have left on the word of the majority leader that there would be no all-night session. I think the only fair thing to do is to recess until tomorrow. Then we shall do our level best to get a unanimous-consent request to vote on this bill. I ask what could be fairer than that.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I have already said that I would be forced to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska objects.

Mr. LUCAS. I modify my request to make it Tuesday next.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator makes it Tuesday and then Wednesday and then Christmas again, I shall object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Illinois state his unanimous-consent request? Does he make his unanimous-consent request for Tuesday under the same conditions?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska objects.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. My colleague [Mr. RUSSELL], who has been in the Chamber most of Friday, Friday night, and to this early hour of Saturday morning, wishes unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate until Monday morning next.

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

DRAFT-EXTENSION BILL

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD a brief statement which I have prepared on an amendment to House bill 6826.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MORSE CONCERNING THE RUSSELL AMENDMENT TO H. R. 6826, THE DRAFT-EXTENSION BILL

I wish to make it clear that I was not present at the meeting of the Senate Armed Services Committee Thursday when the committee voted to report the draft-extension bill with the Russell amendment. Unfortunately, I was at that time attending a meeting of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Had I been present at the Armed Services Committee meeting, I would have opposed the Russell amendment, which has the effect of destroying progress made in the direction of eliminating segregation and discrimination in the armed services.

In my judgment, the Russell amendment is in direct conflict with the stated policy of the administration, as well as contrary to sound Republican principles. It would seriously hamper the military in making full and efficient use of manpower and would be a long step backward to the undemocratic racial policies which have caused so much criticism of our military organization.

It is my earnest hope that the Senate will reject the Russell amendment.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum having been developed, does the Senator from Illinois wish that the order heretofore issued be rescinded?

Mr. LUCAS. I ask that the order heretofore issued be rescinded.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the country will understand the situation and realize that we cannot get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on this bill at any time within the next week or, as the Senator from Nebraska has said, between now and Christmas.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us keep the record straight. The Senator from Illinois made a unanimous-consent request for Tuesday, then for Wednesday, and then he asked, "Will you give a unanimous consent for a vote next Christmas?"

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not say that we would not consent to a unanimous-consent agreement. I said we would come here tomorrow to do our level best to work out a unanimous-consent agreement. If the Senator from Illinois asks for such an agreement any time tonight, even though the vote is set for Christmas, I shall have to object.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no disagreement at all on that. I am glad the Senator made that statement, because we are in total agreement on exactly what was said about Christmas.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to say that I am in thorough accord with the senior Senator from Illinois about Congress adjourning on July 31. I hope when we meet later today we can agree upon a time to vote on the rent-control bill. I say that because I gave my time to it on the committee. We had hearings on it. This was no FEPC bill, on which we did not have any hearings. I hope that later in the morning, if the Senator from Illinois thinks the Senate should now take a recess, we can agree to vote on the bill at a reasonable time. I have no quarrel about the bill one way or the other. I hope we can get along with the business of the Senate and the business of the people.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. I have already told the majority leader that the minority will cooperate with him in working out a program designed to bring about the adjournment of Congress on July 31.

It is now 3 o'clock in the morning, and I suppose Senators are somewhat fatigued, but if we are to do what the majority leader desires, there will have to be cooperation, and I certainly think the junior Senator from Nebraska is not unfair when I say that after just 2 days' debate the only sensible thing to do is to recess until tomorrow and then try to work out a unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Tomorrow will be Sunday.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; then I suggest Saturday, today. Or let the Senate go over until Monday, and work it out on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is nothing now pending before the Senate.

DEATH OF MRS. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate has learned with profound sorrow of the death of Mrs. Arthur H. Vandenberg and extends its sincere sympathy to her bereaved husband, the illustrious senior Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution read by the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 294) was considered and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to join with other Senators in extending to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan and to his family sincere condolences on the death of Mrs. Vandenberg. I did not know until I came on the floor and heard the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] that Mrs. Vandenberg had passed on. I am sure I speak the sentiments of every Senator on the floor when I say that we deeply regret the death of Mrs. Vandenberg, and that we extend to the senior Senator from

Michigan, as well as to his family, our deepest sympathy and condolences.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the majority leader, if he is willing to answer a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I will answer if I can. I am slightly fatigued.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure the Senator can answer the question. I am wondering why the majority leader opposes a vote on a motion to recommit the bill. I have noticed that when we reach the point of voting on motions affecting a bill, usually we dispose of it. If there is a motion to recommit the bill, and a time is set for a vote on the motion, it seems to me that we are making progress, and it should be a very wise thing to do, because certainly we will be faced with such a motion, if there is any Senator who desires to make it. I have seen bills handled before, and whenever we start voting everything begins to dissolve, and we finally reach a conclusion.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I was about to make a statement along the lines of the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado. I was going to say, when I was interrupted by my eloquent friend the Senator from Nebraska, that we have tried in every way possible to get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the bill. I have given the Republicans the green light today to do whatever they wanted to do about a vote on the bill. I have not been able to get any sort of an agreement. Now, it is late in the morning and I should like to make another suggestion. I do not know whether I can get this kind of an agreement or not.

The Senator from Washington said this afternoon that he would probably make a motion along about 5 o'clock to recommit the bill. I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote today, at 4 o'clock p. m., on the motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished majority leader will modify his request so that the vote would come on Monday at 4 o'clock, I should be glad even to make the motion, in the absence of the Senator from Washington, to carry out that part of the agreement. I will make it now if it is necessary to make the motion if the majority leader will modify the request so that the vote will come on Monday at any time the majority leader desires. We may vote 1 hour after the convening of the Senate if necessary. We will cooperate in every way.

I deeply appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Colorado. What he urged was the argument I used this morning in attempting to get a unanimous-consent agreement.

I suggest to the majority leader, in all friendliness, that he modify his request so as to make the vote come on Monday,

and fix the hour at any time he desires after the convening of the Senate. I will make the motion now to recommit, in order to get the matter settled, and will completely cooperate to get the unanimous-consent agreement entered into.

Mr. President, may I make a motion to recommit at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion to recommit is in order at any time.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators will be in order. There is not anything before the Senate to vote on except the bill.

Does the Senator from Nebraska wish to make the motion?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, I should be glad to, if the Senator from Illinois will modify the request.

Mr. LUCAS. I would suggest that the Senator make the hour 1 o'clock Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. I will do that. I will make the hour 1 o'clock, the time to be equally divided between 12 and 1 o'clock, if that is agreeable to the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois modify his request?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the motion to recommit come from the other side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Now the Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that at 1 o'clock on Monday next the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to recommit, and that from 12 o'clock until 1 o'clock the time be equally divided, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I cannot substitute another unanimous-consent request, under the ruling of the Chair, but I wish to make a statement.

There is no reason why the United States Senate tonight, since we have a quorum present, cannot vote on the bill or the motion to recommit. There is no reason why we should "kid" the American people any longer. There are certain Members of the Senate who are honestly against the extension of rent controls. There are others who believe that rent controls should be extended even longer than the bill calls for.

I believe it to be a travesty on the United States Senate and democratic processes for us to fool around here about unanimous-consent agreements. All that has happened today on the other side of the aisle has been nothing but a stall. Every Member of the Senate tonight knows how he is going to vote on the bill and on the motion to recommit. There is a quorum present. We can vote on it now. We have much business to do in the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President—
Mr. MAGNUSON. Just a moment. I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is reserving the right to object.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have only 5 minutes. I do not see any reason at all why the Senate should not vote on this proposition now, or later today, and get it over with. We have all kinds of important legislation to be considered. The pending bill is not one that is new to the Senate. We have had it here now for almost 6 or 7 years. The same propositions are involved, the same testimony is involved, and I should like, if someone objects to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois to propose another unanimous-consent request that we vote on the motion today, Saturday, at 1 or 2 o'clock, or 3 o'clock p. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to point out that it is unreasonable, in my opinion, to ask for a vote on the recommitment of the bill without simultaneously setting a date and an hour when the bill itself can be voted on. If we vote on a motion to recommit, whether it be later today or Monday, without having a unanimous-consent agreement with regard to the time when we vote on the bill, we are going to be in exactly the same situation in which we are now. This is, frankly and honestly stated, a filibuster. There can be no doubt about that. It is my opinion at least that the intention is to delay action on the bill until it cannot be passed in time to continue in effect the present law, which expires on June 30.

There is no doubt that the bill has to be passed by the United States Senate, and later it must be passed by the House of Representatives. Then there must be a conference. Then the bill must go to the President. We have very little time to lose in this matter. I think any proposal for agreement to vote on a motion to recommit should be accompanied by a unanimous-consent request to vote on the bill within a reasonable time after the disposal of the motion to recommit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I object to the unanimous-consent request, and I wish to propound another unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington objects to the request of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I propose a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote on the motion to recommit the bill, the bill itself, and all amendments thereto, at 3 o'clock on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall have to object to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska objects.

The question now is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HUMPHREY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, when I addressed the Chair a while ago and asked to receive recognition, my only purpose was to find out how the time was proposed to be divided, because certain Senators had asked me what time they could speak on Monday. I wanted the Record to show that.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. How long does the Senator expect to speak?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would say for 1 to 2 hours.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

POLITICAL PARTIES AND PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire proposes to address the Senate. This morning I want to discuss the differences between the various kinds of government in the world today.

Broadly speaking, there are three kinds of government in our world. There is the dictatorship—a one-party system of government. Under this plan a minority or dissenting opinion is extremely dangerous; it results in liquidation.

Then there is government by coalition—a multiparty system of government. In France, for example, there have been as many as 22 parties represented in the Chamber of Deputies. None of these parties has enough strength to operate the government. So several parties form a coalition in order to have a government. The cabinet lasts as long as the coalition lasts—falls when a minority party withdraws its support. Even the Communists get in on this coalition. They blackmail the other parties by threatening to withdraw support unless concessions are granted.

Then there is the two-party system of government. This is our system. It is far superior to the other two. Under it, our Nation has furnished mankind's finest example of political, social, and economic advance. We should cherish and protect our two-party system.

Now, all Americans are not automatically members of one of our parties. Not all Americans are either lily white liberal or black conservative. There are shades of opinion. We have minorities in America. And we have a place for minorities in our two-party system.

There are two important facts here. First, our traditional American strength has been found in vertical differences of opinion. What is a vertical difference? We draw our lines from top to bottom. We have rich and poor; good and bad; laborers and managers; Jews and gentiles; Catholics and Protestants; farmers and consumers; representatives of all classes and all creeds and all colors in each of our parties.

A second fact is that each party, in essence, represents a coalition. But the important difference is this: our coalitions are formed before our elections. And our coalitions agree, in advance, to be responsible for our Government for a specified period of time. The voters

can realign the coalition every 2 years by changing the political power of Congress.

Now, there is an inherent danger in our system—an eventuality we must guard against. We support the idea of a vertical separation of opinion, cutting our population from top to bottom. But the danger is that our two parties will become so much alike in what they represent as to offer our voters no clear-cut choice.

The Democrats—through their press and radio—have attempted to sell this idea—the idea that our voters have no clear choice. The Democrats say, "We have a clear-cut program." They claim that the Republicans say, "Me, too" and "Yes, but."

I say the voters have a very clear choice. I say it is our duty to present the issue so clearly that the voters can make no mistake.

The Democrats represent big government, committed to the theory of the welfare state. I like a switch on that word. I like to call it the farewell state, the end of America as we know it. But the best descriptive term probably is the "hand-out state." This is a theory of government which presumes that individuals cannot help themselves at any political level below the stage of Federal planning.

The Republicans represent the idea of individual freedom of choice which we call the opportunity state. This theory of the Republicans holds that men can solve most of their problems by their own initiative—and more of their problems on a local, county, or State level than on the Federal level.

There are two compelling reasons why America needs the Republican Party: First, the idea of the hand-out state is unsound. Although this point is widely debated, I feel that our ideal of the opportunity state is clearly more thoroughly in accord with our democratic traditions.

The second reason why America needs the Republican Party is that the Democratic coalition no longer is capable of furnishing responsible government. Why? In the first place, the coalition assumes too much of a horizontal cleavage to represent American thinking. In the second place, the members of the coalition actually do not support the program for the hand-out state.

Let us examine this Democratic coalition. In reality, it is a monstrosity, conceived in political expediency, and dedicated to maintaining itself. What are its components? It is presently ruled by the offspring of a big city political machine, a child of boss rule. In our largest cities, for the last seven or eight decades, we have periodically suffered the misrule of political machines—controlled by bosses who sometimes derive their financial support from the pay-off of organized crime.

Another part of the Democratic coalition is found in the support afforded by the illogical leftists, those who have prostituted the meaning of a word by calling themselves liberals. Who are they? The American Labor Party in New York; the Americans for Democratic Action; the Socialists, who sup-

ported Norman Thomas as a presidential candidate seven times, but whose swing to the Democrats has prompted Mr. Thomas to retire from the presidential lists; and the Communists.

Who else are Democrats? The big union bosses. From their tremendous treasuries, built from the tribute of the workingmen who pay union dues, these bosses, many of them living like feudal lords, dispense campaign funds in expectation of political reward.

Who else are Democrats? A group I call the blind followers, the solid South. Here are people who were wounded deeply in a great Civil War. They fought that war to protect their economic system. They lost the war. They turned to the Democratic Party as a measure of opposition against the Republican administration which happened to be a war party. They have been blind followers ever since.

Why cannot the Democrats furnish the Nation with responsible government? I think I can show you, Mr. President, with a very simple example.

During the 1948 presidential campaign, as will be recalled, President Truman ran against the Eightieth Congress. He did not run against Thomas Dewey; he took on Congress. At that time he listed 29 bills which he said the Eightieth Congress could have passed in 15 days. The Congress, he said, would thereby have disposed of all the Nation's problems. His 29 bills were, in effect, his platform for reelection.

Harry Truman was elected. The Eighty-first Congress was controlled completely by his party. The Democratic Party claimed it had a mandate from the people. The Eighty-first Congress is nearing the end of its second session. It expects to adjourn in July. What has it done with this so-called mandate? What has Mr. Truman accomplished? How effective has the coalition been?

Well, Mr. President, of the 29 bills President Truman mentioned, parts of 7 have been passed by the Congress his party controls. Remember that he said the Republican Eightieth Congress could have passed all of his 29 bills in 15 days. The Democratic Eighty-first Congress has been in session over 400 days. It has passed parts of seven of his bills.

Do you know what the seven were? First, a loan for construction of the United Nations' headquarters; second an authorization of a National Science Foundation; third, an amendment of the displaced-persons law; fourth, extension of reciprocal trade agreements; fifth, an increase in the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour; sixth, the Taft housing bill; and, seventh, a revision of Federal pay schedule—upward, of course. The point is clear. The Democratic coalition does not believe in the Fair Deal or the hand-out state. If a party does not produce when it is in control, it is not furnishing competent or responsible government.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a few moments ago I moved to recommit the bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I now withdraw that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I believe the failure of the Democrats to enact their program for the hand-out state proves, indirectly perhaps, but nonetheless proves, that the voters really want the opportunity state.

I have a 14-word platform as a basis for building the opportunity state. But before I discuss my suggestions, let me give you a brief résumé of some of my experience as one of 96 Members of the United States Senate since January 1, 1937.

There have been two great fights raging in Congress during the last decade and a half. The third has been the battle to balance the budget. A Democratic Congress has never given this Nation a balanced budget since 1916. A Republican Congress has not failed to balance the budget during the same period.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, with the understanding that by doing so he will not lose the floor?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the Senator yield, with the understanding that by doing so he will not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a moment ago I asked to withdraw my previous motion. I made the request because I felt it would be in the interest of the unanimous-consent request.

I shall be glad to make the motion again if the majority leader feels that there is an opportunity to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the motion; in that event, I shall be glad to renew the motion and to cooperate in any way.

Mr. President, I now ask whether the majority leader has anything of that sort in mind. If so, I shall be glad to cooperate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall make the same unanimous-consent request if the Senator from Nebraska will renew the motion to recommit.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of that statement by the majority leader, I again move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in connection with that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion made by the Senator from Nebraska be taken at 1 o'clock on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has moved that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and the Senator from Illinois has asked unanimous consent that the vote upon the motion be taken on Monday next at 1 o'clock p. m. Is there objection?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me ask whether it is the intention of the Senator from Illinois to include in his request a provision as to the division of the time prior to 1 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I include in my request a further request that on Monday the time between 12 o'clock noon and 1 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, and to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wonder why the time should be set at 1 o'clock. Would the Senators be equally agreeable to having the time set at 4 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. Anything will suit me. Mr. LUCAS. The only point is that if the time for voting is made 1 o'clock, it will then be possible, as the Senator from Nebraska has suggested, that we might finish action on the bill that afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. If the time for voting were set at 4 o'clock, that would make it practically impossible for final action to be taken on the bill on that day.

However, if there is a unanimous-consent agreement that the vote be taken at 1 o'clock on Monday, then there will be the possibility that following the vote at 1 o'clock on the motion to recommit, if the motion to recommit is not agreed to, we might possibly be able to conclude action on the bill that afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. We would cooperate in every way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the motion to recommit the bill has been made, and that the unanimous consent request is, as has been stated, that the vote on the motion to recommit be had on Monday, next, at 1 o'clock, with the time between 12 o'clock noon and 1 o'clock p. m. to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, and to be controlled by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], respectively.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I simply wish to make certain that sufficient time will be allowed. Several Senators have asked me to see that they have 5 minutes, in one case, or 5 minutes, in another case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the request is that the vote be had at 1 o'clock on Monday, as stated.

Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is going to lose it, if I make this motion. It is a very unusual one.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Air Force of the United States are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION— NOMINATION REPORTED ADVERSELY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when we come to the name of Frank E. Hook—

Mr. LUCAS. That is passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we have had a long session. I sincerely hope that under the unanimous-consent agreement which has been made we may be able to finish this bill on Monday afternoon. Obviously I do not want to cut anyone off from legitimate debate. I am satisfied the Senator from New Hampshire is not going to make a speech Monday afternoon of the kind which he started a few moments ago. I am very anxious to hear the Senator at some time. I should like to hear him in private at some time on the very important question he was discussing.

But I express a very sincere hope that we may be able to conclude the vote on the pending bill some time Monday. I will not say now, but there is a possibility, perhaps a probability—and I do not want any doubt about this—that we may have a Monday night session.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the majority leader for his cooperation. I will say now that, after the vote on the motion to recommit, we will do our level best to expedite the debate and, either by unanimous consent or otherwise, to vote as quickly as possible on the whole measure. I assure the majority leader that, whatever is considered the best time that that can be done, we shall do our best to cooperate.

HOW WE CAN AVOID AN ATOMIC WAR
WITH RUSSIA—REPORT BY STUDENTS
AT MODESTO HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter on the subject, How We Can Avoid an Atomic War With Russia, reporting conclusions reached by Mr. Robert M. Gordon's sixth period American history class of Modesto High School, Modesto, Calif. The class has been studying this problem, and I believe their conclusions expressed in the letter will be found of much interest to Senators. The letter is signed by Mr. Robert M. Gordon, teacher, and 29 members of the class.

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

MODESTO HIGH SCHOOL,
Modesto, Calif., May 19, 1950.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: We, the students of Mr. Robert Gordon's sixth period American history class, have been studying the problems of how we can avoid an atomic war with Russia. After investigating the material made available to us we have reached the following conclusion:

1. We should stop the spread of communism.

(a) To investigate all high Government officials who are suspicious.

(b) To outlaw all political parties who are working for the overthrow of the American way of life.

(c) To keep up employment and to do away with race discrimination.

(d) Support the democratic nations.

2. Be aware of the dangers leading to war and avoid them.

(a) Economic and political.

(b) Hatred, violence, fear, ignorance, and propaganda among the people in the United States and other countries.

3. A plan in distributing munitions and excess food to nations fighting communism.

(a) Vigorous extension of the Marshall plan.

4. Avoid isolation and armed neutrality.

5. Protect the interests of the United States and other democratic nations by stopping imperialism.

6. Remove these weaknesses in the United States:

(a) Economic (depressions, labor-management disputes).

(b) Social (race discrimination).

(c) Political (subversive groups).

(d) Moral (strengthening the American as an individual).

7. We should better our future foreign policy by a more careful study of our past mistakes.

We sincerely hope this material will assist you in formulating the future foreign policy and in keeping America safe and strong.

Sincerely,

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 43 minutes a. m. Saturday, June 10) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 12, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of June 7), 1950:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) have been examined for physical fitness and found physically qualified for promotion. All others are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be colonels

(X) Lawrence Wendall Adams, (X) Henry Carlton Ahalt, (X) Willet John Baird, (X) Arthur Hodgkins Bender, (X) Robert Ernest Benjamin, (X) Paul John Black, (X) Brookner West Brady, (X) William Crawford Denniston Bridges, (X) James Trimble Brown, (X) Rothwell Hutton Brown, (X) William Hans Brunke, (X) John Robert Burns, (X) Tyler Calhoun, Jr., (X) George Emmett Campbell, (X) Clifton Coleman Carter, (X) James Byron Colson, (X) Robert Thomas Connor, (X) John Albert Dabney, (X) James Robert Davidson, (X) Thomas Edward de Shazo, (X) Camille Henry Du Val, (X) John Francis Fiske, (X) Albert Gallatin Franklin, Jr., (X) Thomas Lee Gaines, (X) William Preston Grace, Jr., (X) John Norvell Green, (X) Richard Hanson Grinder, (X) Harry McNeill Grizzard, (X) Noble Theodore Haakensen, (X) Thomas Marshall Hahn, (X) Donald Herbert Hale, (X) Paul Hamilton, (X) Frank-Ervine Hankinson, Jr., (X) Malcolm Hobson Harwell, (X) William Benjamin Hawthorne, (X) Roy Jacob Herte, (X) Frank Coffin Holbrook, (X) Donald Melville Jacques, (X) Thomas Howard James, (X) Theodore Trower King, (X) Walter Byron Larew, (X) Frank Neuman Leakey, (X) Robert Vernon Lee, (X) George Olaf Norman Lodoen, (X) Jay B. Loyless, (X) Mason Harley Lucas, (X) Henry Louis Luongo, (X) John Marion Lydick, (X) John Joseph Madigan, Jr., (X) Charles Weller McCarthy, (X) Edward Harold McDaniel, (X) John Anthony McFarland, (X) Robert Lee Miller, (X) Frank Freeman Miter, (X) Frederick Prall Nunson, (X) Paul Burnham Nelson, (X) Robert Sylvester Nourse, (X) Frank Crawford Paul, (X) Herbert Butler Powell, (X) John Sieba Roosma, (X) Robert Charles Ross, (X) Henry McKie Salley, (X) Alexander Randolph Sewall, (X) Henry Lee Shafer, (X) Charles Albert Sheldon, (X) Cleo Zachariah Shugart, (X) Roy Silverman, (X) Charles Clifford Sloane, Jr., (X) Mark Alexander Herbert Smith, (X) Harry Purnell Storke, (X) Benjamin Branche Talley, (X) John Osman Taylor, (X) Alfred Garvin Texley, (X) Albert Jerome Thackston, Jr., (X) Oliver Wolcott van den Berg, (X) John Gibson Van Houten, (X) James Oka Wade, (X) John Emmett Walker, (X) Edgar Richard Curtis Ward, (X) Harry Joseph Wheaton, (X) James Russell Wheaton, (X) Norman Mahlon Winn, (X) Layton Allen Zimmer, (X) George John Zimmerman, (X) Roger Hubbard Allbee, (X) Joe Alexander Bain, (X) Clifford Gordon Blitch, (X) Ralph Llewellyn Cox, (X) John Lemoin Crawford, (X) Jackson Bernard Dismukes, (X) Claude Cordray Dodson, (X) Vernon James Erkenbeck, (X) John Bernard Herman, (X) Paul Aloysius Keeney, (X) Urho Robert Merikangas, (X) Henry Schultdt Murphey, (X) George Merle Powell, (X) George Prazak, (X) Robert Purcell Rea, (X) Joseph Pease Russell, (X) Joseph Robert Shaeffer, (X) Emmett Montgomery Smith, (X) Walter Herbert Stevenson, (X) Arthur Eugene White, (X) William Darrell Willis, (X) Leonard Frank Wilson, (X) Charles William Buttermore, (X) H. Beecher Dierdorff, (X) Lynn Clifford Dirksen, (X) Joseph Fryer Houck, (X) William Thomas Williams, (X) Robert Lee Black, (X) Robert Edward Selwyn, (X) James Francis Adams, (X) John Joseph Agoa, (X) Delmer Pearl Anderson, (X) Charles Parmelee Babcock, (X) Paul Levera Bates, (X) James Knox Bell, (X) Earl Stewart Bessmer, (X) Harold Edwin Bisbort, (X) James Glen Black, (X) Weston Locke Blanchard, (X) William Stephen Bodner, (X) John Albertson Bradley, (X) Harry Cockrell Brindle, (X) Harley Derrell Brown, (X) Kirk Buchak, (X) Robert Scott Cain, (X) Harold Andrew Cas, (X) Raymond Timothy Chapman, (X) Orman Goodyear Charles, (X) Walter Lee Coleman, (X) Robert Henry Conk, (X) Arthur Edward Conn, (X) Malcolm Wesley Courser,

(X) Henry McKie Salley, (X) Alexander Randolph Sewall, (X) Henry Lee Shafer, (X) Charles Albert Sheldon, (X) Cleo Zachariah Shugart, (X) Roy Silverman, (X) Charles Clifford Sloane, Jr., (X) Mark Alexander Herbert Smith, (X) Harry Purnell Storke, (X) Benjamin Branche Talley, (X) John Osman Taylor, (X) Alfred Garvin Texley, (X) Albert Jerome Thackston, Jr., (X) Oliver Wolcott van den Berg, (X) John Gibson Van Houten, (X) James Oka Wade, (X) John Emmett Walker, (X) Edgar Richard Curtis Ward, (X) Harry Joseph Wheaton, (X) James Russell Wheaton, (X) Norman Mahlon Winn, (X) Layton Allen Zimmer, (X) George John Zimmerman, (X) Roger Hubbard Allbee, (X) Joe Alexander Bain, (X) Clifford Gordon Blitch, (X) Ralph Llewellyn Cox, (X) John Lemoin Crawford, (X) Jackson Bernard Dismukes, (X) Claude Cordray Dodson, (X) Vernon James Erkenbeck, (X) John Bernard Herman, (X) Paul Aloysius Keeney, (X) Urho Robert Merikangas, (X) Henry Schultdt Murphey, (X) George Merle Powell, (X) George Prazak, (X) Robert Purcell Rea, (X) Joseph Pease Russell, (X) Joseph Robert Shaeffer, (X) Emmett Montgomery Smith, (X) Walter Herbert Stevenson, (X) Arthur Eugene White, (X) William Darrell Willis, (X) Leonard Frank Wilson, (X) Charles William Buttermore, (X) H. Beecher Dierdorff, (X) Lynn Clifford Dirksen, (X) Joseph Fryer Houck, (X) William Thomas Williams, (X) Robert Lee Black, (X) Robert Edward Selwyn, (X) James Francis Adams, (X) John Joseph Agoa, (X) Delmer Pearl Anderson, (X) Charles Parmelee Babcock, (X) Paul Levera Bates, (X) James Knox Bell, (X) Earl Stewart Bessmer, (X) Harold Edwin Bisbort, (X) James Glen Black, (X) Weston Locke Blanchard, (X) William Stephen Bodner, (X) John Albertson Bradley, (X) Harry Cockrell Brindle, (X) Harley Derrell Brown, (X) Kirk Buchak, (X) Robert Scott Cain, (X) Harold Andrew Cas, (X) Raymond Timothy Chapman, (X) Orman Goodyear Charles, (X) Walter Lee Coleman, (X) Robert Henry Conk, (X) Arthur Edward Conn, (X) Malcolm Wesley Courser,

To be colonels, Medical Corps

(X) Roger Hubbard Allbee, (X) Joe Alexander Bain, (X) Clifford Gordon Blitch, (X) Ralph Llewellyn Cox, (X) John Lemoin Crawford, (X) Jackson Bernard Dismukes, (X) Claude Cordray Dodson, (X) Vernon James Erkenbeck, (X) John Bernard Herman, (X) Paul Aloysius Keeney, (X) Urho Robert Merikangas, (X) Henry Schultdt Murphey, (X) George Merle Powell, (X) George Prazak, (X) Robert Purcell Rea, (X) Joseph Pease Russell, (X) Joseph Robert Shaeffer, (X) Emmett Montgomery Smith, (X) Walter Herbert Stevenson, (X) Arthur Eugene White, (X) William Darrell Willis, (X) Leonard Frank Wilson, (X) Charles William Buttermore, (X) H. Beecher Dierdorff, (X) Lynn Clifford Dirksen, (X) Joseph Fryer Houck, (X) William Thomas Williams, (X) Robert Lee Black, (X) Robert Edward Selwyn, (X) James Francis Adams, (X) John Joseph Agoa, (X) Delmer Pearl Anderson, (X) Charles Parmelee Babcock, (X) Paul Levera Bates, (X) James Knox Bell, (X) Earl Stewart Bessmer, (X) Harold Edwin Bisbort, (X) James Glen Black, (X) Weston Locke Blanchard, (X) William Stephen Bodner, (X) John Albertson Bradley, (X) Harry Cockrell Brindle, (X) Harley Derrell Brown, (X) Kirk Buchak, (X) Robert Scott Cain, (X) Harold Andrew Cas, (X) Raymond Timothy Chapman, (X) Orman Goodyear Charles, (X) Walter Lee Coleman, (X) Robert Henry Conk, (X) Arthur Edward Conn, (X) Malcolm Wesley Courser,

To be colonels, Dental Corps

(X) Charles William Buttermore, (X) H. Beecher Dierdorff, (X) Lynn Clifford Dirksen, (X) Joseph Fryer Houck, (X) William Thomas Williams, (X) Robert Lee Black, (X) Robert Edward Selwyn, (X) James Francis Adams, (X) John Joseph Agoa, (X) Delmer Pearl Anderson, (X) Charles Parmelee Babcock, (X) Paul Levera Bates, (X) James Knox Bell, (X) Earl Stewart Bessmer, (X) Harold Edwin Bisbort, (X) James Glen Black, (X) Weston Locke Blanchard, (X) William Stephen Bodner, (X) John Albertson Bradley, (X) Harry Cockrell Brindle, (X) Harley Derrell Brown, (X) Kirk Buchak, (X) Robert Scott Cain, (X) Harold Andrew Cas, (X) Raymond Timothy Chapman, (X) Orman Goodyear Charles, (X) Walter Lee Coleman, (X) Robert Henry Conk, (X) Arthur Edward Conn, (X) Malcolm Wesley Courser,

To be colonels, Medical Service Corps

(X) Robert Lee Black, (X) Robert Edward Selwyn, (X) James Francis Adams, (X) John Joseph Agoa, (X) Delmer Pearl Anderson, (X) Charles Parmelee Babcock, (X) Paul Levera Bates, (X) James Knox Bell, (X) Earl Stewart Bessmer, (X) Harold Edwin Bisbort, (X) James Glen Black, (X) Weston Locke Blanchard, (X) William Stephen Bodner, (X) John Albertson Bradley, (X) Harry Cockrell Brindle, (X) Harley Derrell Brown, (X) Kirk Buchak, (X) Robert Scott Cain, (X) Harold Andrew Cas, (X) Raymond Timothy Chapman, (X) Orman Goodyear Charles, (X) Walter Lee Coleman, (X) Robert Henry Conk, (X) Arthur Edward Conn, (X) Malcolm Wesley Courser,

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels

(X) James Francis Adams, (X) John Joseph Agoa, (X) Delmer Pearl Anderson, (X) Charles Parmelee Babcock, (X) Paul Levera Bates, (X) James Knox Bell, (X) Earl Stewart Bessmer, (X) Harold Edwin Bisbort, (X) James Glen Black, (X) Weston Locke Blanchard, (X) William Stephen Bodner, (X) John Albertson Bradley, (X) Harry Cockrell Brindle, (X) Harley Derrell Brown, (X) Kirk Buchak, (X) Robert Scott Cain, (X) Harold Andrew Cas, (X) Raymond Timothy Chapman, (X) Orman Goodyear Charles, (X) Walter Lee Coleman, (X) Robert Henry Conk, (X) Arthur Edward Conn, (X) Malcolm Wesley Courser,

× Robert Roland Creighton, [REDACTED]
 Mattison Albert Darragh, [REDACTED]
 Jay Alexander Dasche, [REDACTED]
 Alfred Harry Davidson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Homer Littlefield Davis, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert Gibson Davis, [REDACTED]
 Roland Haddaway del Mar, [REDACTED]
 Ralph Anthony Devine, [REDACTED]
 Silas Benjamin Dishan, [REDACTED]
 Edwin Hart Druley, [REDACTED]
 John Richard Dwyer, [REDACTED]
 Alexander George Eagle, [REDACTED]
 William Thomas Evans, [REDACTED]
 Russell Decatur Fagin, [REDACTED]
 Wesley Earl Farmer, [REDACTED]
 × Harry Otto Fischer, [REDACTED]
 Maxwell Birge Fogarty, [REDACTED]
 Victor B. Fox, [REDACTED]
 Sidney Dilg Frampton, [REDACTED]
 Ralph Bonner Garretson, [REDACTED]
 Cecil Gordon Gealta, [REDACTED]
 John Hamilton Gibson, [REDACTED]
 × Roy Edward Goode, [REDACTED]
 Fred Joe Gosiger, [REDACTED]
 × Edward Jackson Grant, [REDACTED]
 Fred Wilbur Greene, [REDACTED]
 × Arthur Wilfred Gustafson, [REDACTED]
 Dwight Thornton Hamersley, [REDACTED]
 Albert Joseph Hannon, [REDACTED]
 George Samuel Haviland, [REDACTED]
 William Robinson Heard, [REDACTED]
 Sherburne Jackson Heilker, [REDACTED]
 × William Edward Heltzel, [REDACTED]
 Blair Elliot Henderson, [REDACTED]
 Conrad Hildebrandt, [REDACTED]
 Jacy Farnell Hudson, [REDACTED]
 Earl Leroy Icke, [REDACTED]
 Frank Strother Ison, [REDACTED]
 Albert Havens Jackman, [REDACTED]
 Hans Godfrey Jepson, [REDACTED]
 George Victor Johnson, [REDACTED]
 John Elvin Johnson, [REDACTED]
 Slastcho Katsersky, [REDACTED]
 Evander Francis Kelly, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William Leonard Kerr, [REDACTED]
 Arthur Gustav Kiel, [REDACTED]
 Eldon Alfred Koerner, [REDACTED]
 Jean Paul LaCour, [REDACTED]
 William Francis LaFarge, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Silas Roswell Langlois, [REDACTED]
 John Henry Lattin, [REDACTED]
 Charles Allen Leavitt, [REDACTED]
 John Eugene Londahl, [REDACTED]
 Frederick Howard Loomis, [REDACTED]
 William Arthur Luther, [REDACTED]
 Herbert Gregory Lux, [REDACTED]
 Cecil Malcolm MacGregor, [REDACTED]
 John Albert Martin, [REDACTED]
 William Arthur McAleer, [REDACTED]
 John Patrick McKenna, [REDACTED]
 Charles Heron McNary, [REDACTED]
 Chester Harold Meek, [REDACTED]
 Marion Claude Miller, [REDACTED]
 James Alden Norell, [REDACTED]
 Walter Lawrence Norfray, [REDACTED]
 John Dudley Peterman, [REDACTED]
 Robert Otto Peterson, [REDACTED]
 Fred Lewis Platte, [REDACTED]
 Seymour Austin Potter, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Frank Henry Preston, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James Willard Pumpelly, [REDACTED]
 Paul Howard Raftery, [REDACTED]
 Charles Beecher Reed, [REDACTED]
 Prentiss Bishop Reed, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lloyd Milton Reiser, [REDACTED]
 Angelo Michael Ricciardelli, [REDACTED]
 James Abner Richardson 3d, [REDACTED]
 Robinson Baird Rider, [REDACTED]
 Charles Lacy Ringgold, [REDACTED]
 Ernest Lee Roy Ritchie, [REDACTED]
 Frank Wright Roberts, [REDACTED]
 William Maxwell Rodgers, [REDACTED]
 Frazer Woodruff Rodman, [REDACTED]
 Franz Heiberger Ross, [REDACTED]
 Wenzel David Roth, [REDACTED]
 Charles Edwin Rust, [REDACTED]
 Teddy Hollis Sanford, [REDACTED]
 Orlando Adam Scott, [REDACTED]
 Paul Anthony Shaw, [REDACTED]
 Edwin Courtney Shewbridge, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Byron Martin Shipley, [REDACTED]

George Harvey Sibbald, [REDACTED]
 Herman Richard Siemers, [REDACTED]
 Tom Watson Sills, [REDACTED]
 Kermit James Silverwood, [REDACTED]
 Robert Newell Skaggs, [REDACTED]
 Braxton Eugene Small, [REDACTED]
 Albert Mark Smith 2d, [REDACTED]
 Frederick Gustin Hall Smith, [REDACTED]
 Dane Oatman Sprankle, [REDACTED]
 × Alfred Earl Stevens, [REDACTED]
 Robert Beverly Taylor, [REDACTED]
 Thomas Harwood Taylor, [REDACTED]
 Douglas Osborne Toft, [REDACTED]
 Robert Humphrey Tomlinson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Joseph Rupel Walton, [REDACTED]
 Arthur James Watson, [REDACTED]
 Robert Weir-Mitchell Weir, [REDACTED]
 Clayton Wallace Wells, [REDACTED]
 Charles Peter West, [REDACTED]
 William James Whitehead, [REDACTED]
 Rudolph George Winckler, [REDACTED]
 Edwin Samuel Winsper, [REDACTED]

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

James Chadwick Bales, [REDACTED]
 Clarence Grady Collins, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Bruce Utiger Crozier, [REDACTED]
 John Raymond Fitzpatrick, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William Milton Glasgow, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ray Roselle Hoke, [REDACTED]
 James Lunsford Morrison, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Allan Thorndyke Sylvester 2d, [REDACTED]
 Planter Madden Wilson, [REDACTED]

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

Barbara May Knickerbocker, [REDACTED]
 Barbara Dean Viets, [REDACTED]
 Jacquelin Latham Wright, [REDACTED]

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be majors, Women's Army Corps

Harriet Cecelia Bendfelt, [REDACTED]
 Ruth Mary Briggs, [REDACTED]
 Hazel Buttrick Bundy, [REDACTED]
 Margaret Wolfenden Condon, [REDACTED]
 Isabella Martin Henry, [REDACTED]
 Lois Ellen Hudson, [REDACTED]
 Erma Doris Keener, [REDACTED]
 Mary Josephine Kunz, [REDACTED]
 Cecile Maldevan Lane, [REDACTED]
 Margaret Nettie Lassetter, [REDACTED]
 Julia Josephine Mulcahy, [REDACTED]
 Helen Marie Roy, [REDACTED]
 Ruth Nevil Simerly, [REDACTED]
 Lois Marie Sproull, [REDACTED]
 Ruth Snyder Westbrook, [REDACTED]
 Adeline Grace Wheatley, [REDACTED]

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Carolyn Maude Anthony, [REDACTED]
 Imogen Elaine Averett, [REDACTED]
 Doris LaVerne Ayers, [REDACTED]
 Mildred Caroon Bailey, [REDACTED]
 Maxene Monetta Baker, [REDACTED]
 Susan Ellen Bastion, [REDACTED]
 Evelyn Catherine Brown, [REDACTED]
 Lane Carlson, [REDACTED]
 Alice Lorraine Dahnke, [REDACTED]
 Virginia Ruth Deady, [REDACTED]
 Jimmie Burdine Dollahite, [REDACTED]
 Evelyn Brent Fraser, [REDACTED]
 Margaret Marion Gentle, [REDACTED]
 Neva Gertrude Gillis, [REDACTED]
 Clara Goldman, [REDACTED]
 Dorothy Gray, [REDACTED]

Mary Julia Guyette, [REDACTED]
 Marcellette Lucille Kerr Hall, [REDACTED]
 Dorothy Alice King, [REDACTED]
 Marie Sylvia Knasiak, [REDACTED]
 Constance Dena Kolokotronis, [REDACTED]
 Martha Louise Mills, [REDACTED]
 Betty Lorraine Parker, [REDACTED]
 Dorothy Whitcomb Parks, [REDACTED]
 Minnie Pearl Patterson, [REDACTED]
 Della Durline Robinson, [REDACTED]
 Iona Bond Sherman, [REDACTED]
 Margaret Elizabeth Sinclair, [REDACTED]
 Mary Emily Stanton, [REDACTED]
 Katherine Louise Sutherland, [REDACTED]
 Eileen Roberta Ware, [REDACTED]
 Avis Merle Watkins, [REDACTED]
 Carol Mae Williams, [REDACTED]

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CONNECTICUT

William J. Higgins, New Haven, Conn., in place of P. J. Goode, retired.

ILLINOIS

Virgil F. Reither, Beardstown, Ill., in place of L. G. Schaeffer, resigned.

Lester V. McCandless, Brookport, Ill., in place of Leslie Lynn, transferred.

Evert L. Giesler, Cisco, Ill., in place of J. A. Giesler, transferred.

Richard E. Ellison, Decatur, Ill., in place of J. M. Allen, retired.

Chester L. Kampert, Fox River Grove, Ill., in place of W. W. Hynous, transferred.

Oscar R. Poorman, Humboldt, Ill., in place of G. M. Poorman, deceased.

Paul J. Gibling, Ivesdale, Ill., in place of C. V. Manny, transferred.

Robert J. Horn, Mount Pulaski, Ill., in place of C. H. Anderson, transferred.

Claude Wilbur Frank, Plano, Ill., in place of W. D. Steward, retired.

Mary C. Morrissey, Utica, Ill., in place of J. J. Morrissey, deceased.

KANSAS

Joseph F. Coyle, Kansas City, Kans., in place of A. H. Gillis, retired.

KENTUCKY

Benson G. Leichhardt, Bowling Green, Ky., in place of H. W. Sublett, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Daniel F. Cahill, Lawrence, Mass., in place of C. A. Cronin, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Robert J. Gittersonke, Bridgman, Mich., in place of G. H. Knaak, Jr., resigned.

Gust C. Burandt, Coldwater, Mich., in place of M. W. Olds, retired.

MINNESOTA

Ray F. Schisler, Worthington, Minn., in place of L. M. Harper, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Harry B. Burton, North Platte, Nebr., in place of H. A. Langford, transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

Henry A. Miller, Bayboro, N. C., in place of Bethany Campen, retired.

Hope R. Heath, Cove City, N. C., in place of C. R. Heath, resigned.

Leslie P. Gardner, Goldsboro, N. C., in place of J. H. Hawley, deceased.

OHIO

Paul E. Puhl, Maumee, Ohio, in place of C. H. Love, retired.

James E. Mattox, Westerville, Ohio, in place of Robert Wilson, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

James A. Barkley, Latrobe, Pa., in place of J. P. Doherty, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Kenneth W. McNeilly, Colfax, Wash., in place of H. O. Thompson, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of June 7), 1950:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Roscoe Bonham, ~~XXXX~~ et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 31, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Roscoe Bonham, which appears on page 7871, and ending with the name of William T. Withers, which appears on the same page.

AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William Ellsworth Kepner, ~~XXXX~~ (major general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be commander in chief, Alaskan command, with rank of lieutenant general with date of rank from date of appointment.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Albert Leo Cutress, ~~XXXX~~ et al., for promotion in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 1, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Albert Leo Cutress, which appears on page 7920, and ending with the name of Veleka Barbara Staudt, which appears on page 7922.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

Capt. Daniel W. Ryan, Dental Corps, United States Navy, for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the United States Navy.

The nominations of Richard A. Frohreich et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 31, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Richard A. Frohreich, which appears on page 7871, and ending with the name of George E. Sherman, which appears on page 7872.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Robert D. Shaffer et al., for appointment in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 31, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Robert D. Shaffer, which appears on page 7872, and ending with the name of George W. Yates, which appears on the same page.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 7, 1950)

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, at this white altar of prayer and of peace where all the opinions and convictions which divide us

grow dim and are forgotten, in the solemn spiritual verities that bind us together, we bow in reverence and humility praying for the enthronement of brotherhood in all the earth. May the institutions of justice, understanding, and cooperative endeavor never be sabotaged by bad faith; but, rather, become the instrument of Thy providence in bringing at last the fulfillment of the prophet's dream: "Violence shall be no more heard in thy lands, wastage nor destruction within thy borders."

Through the lips that speak in this forum of freedom may there be heard by a listening world the solemn summons to men of good will, of all kindreds and tongues, to a new commonwealth of all peoples, in which power shall be administered as a sacred trust dedicated to the common good. 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 Friday, June 9, 1950, and Saturday, June 10, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHOEPP, Mr. DARBY, and Mr. LODGE were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORSE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate through June 21.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WILEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. IVES was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, in behalf of Mr. FREAR, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Utilities of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Saturday, the time from now until 1 o'clock is equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the motion to recommit to the Committee on Banking and Currency the bill S. 3181, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire from both Senators

whether they would like to have a quorum call, the time consumed thereby to be divided equally between them.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. In response to the question of the Senator from Illinois, the junior Senator from Washington thinks it would be extremely proper that time be allotted jointly by the Senator from South Carolina and myself for the purpose of securing a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that satisfactory to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to suggest that, if possible, a time limit be set on the quorum call, and that if a quorum is not developed promptly we should proceed, because some Senators wish to speak for a few minutes, and we have to vote at 1 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the vote at 1 o'clock will be on the motion to recommit the bill. There is no way of fixing a time limit on a quorum call. If an announcement of no quorum is made, the quorum call must be concluded. If before the first call is concluded no announcement of the absence of a quorum is made, the request for a quorum call may be withdrawn.

Mr. MAYBANK. I made the suggestion because several Senators would like to speak on the pending question.

Mr. CAIN. Would the Senator from South Carolina permit the suggestion that we have a quorum and see where we stand in terms of those present in, say, 15 minutes?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Vice President stated that we cannot stop a quorum call once it is undertaken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; if before the first call is concluded no announcement of the absence of a quorum is made, the request may be withdrawn.

Mr. MAYBANK. Under those circumstances I suggest the absence of a quorum, if that is agreeable to the majority and the Senator from Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am in complete accord with the suggestion of an absence of a quorum. However, if a Senator objects to the withdrawal of the order for a quorum call, we shall be bound to proceed with it, regardless of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAYBANK. We shall have to take that chance.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; we shall have to take that chance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a call of the roll be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order for a quorum call is rescinded, and further proceedings under the order will be suspended.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to make only a very brief state-