

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 15, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate August 14 (legislative day of July 20), 1950:

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Frank William Milburn, O3738, United States Army, for appointment as a corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of majesty and mercy, we are coming unto Thee impelled and inspired by the glorious promises that "they who wait upon the Lord shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint."

Grant that in these days of crisis and destiny we may have the vision to see that all our plans and purposes, all our decisions and actions must be implemented with those spiritual dynamics and resources which Thou hast ordained and placed at our disposal if we would aspire to build a nobler civilization.

We pray that the minds and hearts of all who share in the responsibilities of government may be strong and vigorous in faith and courage as they seek in unity of spirit to perform the many challenging duties of their high vocation.

Hear us through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 11, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 21) entitled "A joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1858. An act to permit the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were com-

municated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on August 12, 1950, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2225. An act for the relief of William B. Buol.

CERTIFICATION OF CONTEMPT CITATIONS

The SPEAKER announced that pursuant to sundry resolutions of the House, he did, on Saturday, August 12, 1950, make certifications to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, and the United States attorney, District of Hawaii, as follows:

To the United States attorney, District of Columbia:

House Resolution 751: The refusal of Philip Bart to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 752: The refusal of James J. Matles to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 753: The refusal of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 754: The refusal of Thomas Quinn to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 755: The refusal of Frank Panzino to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 795: The refusal of Giovanni Rossi Lomanitz to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 796: The refusal of David Joseph Bohm to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 797: The refusal of Irving David Fox to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 798: The refusal of Clarence Hiskey to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 799: The refusal of Frank Hashmall to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 800: The refusal of Talmadge Raley to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 801: The refusal of Esther Tice to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 802: The refusal of Marcel Scherer to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 803: The refusal of Mrs. Louise Berman to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 804: The refusal of Pasquale Leonard James Branca to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

To the United States attorney, District of Hawaii:

House Resolution 756: The refusal of Ralph Tokunaga to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 758: The refusal of Dwight James Freeman to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 760: The refusal of Rachel Saiki to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 761: The refusal of John Reinecke to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 762: The refusal of Ernest Arena to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 763: The refusal of Koichi Imori to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 764: The refusal of Denichi Kimoto to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 765: The refusal of Pearl Freeman to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 766: The refusal of Marshall McEuen to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 767: The refusal of Ruth Ozaki to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 768: The refusal of Stephen Murin to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 770: The refusal of Frank Silva to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 771: The refusal of Jack Kawano to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 773: The refusal of Yukio Abe to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 774: The refusal of Yasuki Arakaki to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 775: The refusal of Edward Hong to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 776: The refusal of Kameo Ichimura to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 777: The refusal of Douglas Inouye to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 779: The refusal of Adele Kensinger to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 780: The refusal of Ben Kaahawihui to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 781: The refusal of Frank Kalua to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 782: The refusal of Yoshito Marumo to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 783: The refusal of Robert Murasaki to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 784: The refusal of Robert McElrath to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 785: The refusal of Julian Napuunua to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 786: The refusal of Castner Tadashi Ogawa to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 787: The refusal of Hideo Okada to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 788: The refusal of Wilfred Oka to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 789: The refusal of Jeanette Nakama Rohrbough to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 791: The refusal of Frank Takahashi to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 792: The refusal of Shigeo Takemoto to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 793: The refusal of Ralph Vossbrink to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 794: The refusal of Thomas Yagi to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 769: The refusal of Jack Hall to answer a question before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 772: The refusal of John Akana to answer a question before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 778: The refusal of Levi Kealoha to answer a question before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 790: The refusal of Mitsuo Shimizu to answer a question before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 757: The refusal of Charles Fujimoto to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities, and the willful and deliberate refusal of Charles Fujimoto to produce all membership records, all records of dues payment, and all financial records, ledgers or books, and all correspondence files of the Communist Party in Hawaii, before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 759: The refusal of Esther Bristow to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities, and the willful and deliberate refusal of Esther Bristow to produce any and all financial statements of the Hawaii Civil Liberties Committee, including canceled checks, and ledgers of the said organization, before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANFIELD) there were—yeas 24, noes 59.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee demanded the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has a right to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania for what purpose he rose.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee has already objected on that ground.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee changed his request and demanded the yeas and nays because he realized you cannot get a yea-and-nay vote on a motion to adjourn by a point of no quorum. The gentleman from Tennessee has changed his request to a demand for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. If the negative carries you can; if the affirmative carries you cannot, under the rules of the House.

What motion did the gentleman from Tennessee make?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I asked for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 48, nays 274, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

YEAS—48

Abbutt	Fisher	McCormack
Abernethy	Fugate	McMillan, S. C.
Andrews	Gary	Murray, Tenn.
Bentsen	Gathings	Passman
Burleson	Gossett	Poage
Burton	Gregory	Preston
Camp	Hardy	Rankin
Cannon	Harrison	Richards
Cooper	Herlong	Robeson
Cox	Hobbs	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Deane	Kilday	Taber
Eberharter	Larcade	Teague

Thomas
Thornberry
Trimble

Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen,
August H.
Angell
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Biemiller
Bishop
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Bonner
Bosone
Boykin
Bramblett
Breen
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burdick
Burke
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carnahan
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Celler
Chelf
Chesney
Christopher
Clemente
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Combs
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Crook
Cresser
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davenport
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Durham
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elston
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Felghan
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandez
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz

Addonizio
Barden
Barrett, Wyo.
Blackney
Boggs, Del.

Wheeler
Whitaker
Whitten

NAYS—274

Gavin
Gillmer
Golden
Goodwin
Gordon
Graham
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gross
Guill
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall
Edwin Arthur
Halleck
Hand
Harris
Hart
Harvey
Havener
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Heslton
Hill
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Huber
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Javits
Jenison
Jennings
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kerr
Kilburn
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Kunkel
Lane
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lichtenwalter
Lind
Linehan
Lovre
Lyle
McCarthy
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGrath
McGregor
McGuire
McKinnon
McSweeney
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Mahon
Mansfield
Marsalis
Marshall
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miles
Miller, Calif.

NOT VOTING—108

Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Bulwinkle
Carlyle
Carroll
Cavalcante
Chatham
Chiperfield
Chudoff

Whittington
Wilson, Tex.
Wood

Miller, Md.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Nicholson
Noland
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Patman
Patterson
Perkins
Peterson
Pfeifer
Joseph L.

Phillbin
Phillips, Calif.
Plumley
Polk
Poulson
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Riehlman
Rivers
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sasser
Saylor
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Shafer
Shelley
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sims
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Staggers
Stigler
Stockman
Sullivan
Sutton
Tackett
Taylor
Thompson
Tollefson
Van Zandt
Wagner
Walter
Welch
White, Calif.
Whidall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Okla.
Withrow
Wolverton
Woodhouse
Woodruff
Yates
Young
Zablocki

Clevenger
Cole, N. Y.
Cooley
Crawford
Davies, N. Y.
Denton
D'Ewart
Dingell
Dondero
Doyle
Eaton
Engel, Mich.
Fallon
Frazier
Furcolo
Gillette
Gore
Gorski
Hall
Leonard W.
Harden
Hare
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Herter
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hollfield
James
Jenkins
Johnson

Jonas
Keefe
Kelley, Pa.
Kennedy
Lanham
Latham
Lodge
Lucas
Lynch
McMillen, Ill.
Mack, Ill.
Macy
Magee
Marcantonio
Mason
Morgan
Morton
Murray, Wis.
Nelson
Nixon
Norton
O'Hara, Ill.
Pace
Patten
Pfeiffer
William L.
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Potter
Powell
Quinn
Redden

Regan
Rich
Rodino
Roosevelt
Sabath
Sadowski
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Sheppard
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Talle
Tauriello
Towe
Underwood
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Walsh
Werdel
White, Idaho
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Winstead
Wolcott

So the House refused to adjourn. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Lodge.
Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Marcantonio with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Frazier.
Mr. Walsh with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Harnden.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Tauriello with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Willis with Mr. James.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Talle.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Stefan.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Smathers with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Stanley with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Nixon.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. Magee with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Lucas with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Pickett with Mr. Nelson.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Thompson with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Carroll with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Wadsworth.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under the rule I call up the

petition to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of House Resolution 667 providing for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8195, a bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing postal services.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman sign the discharge petition?

Mr. MILLER of California. I did, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, I claim the time allotted to the opposition.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How is the minority going to get any time under this proceeding?

The SPEAKER. Under the precedents of the House the chairman of the committee which is proposed to be discharged is entitled to recognition to control the time in opposition, if he be opposed to the resolution; in this instance the gentleman from Georgia is entitled to recognition if he is opposed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the soundness of the ruling, but I just wondered where we were going to come in.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman wanted to appeal to those who yield time he might get time in that way.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority be given 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, the Chair cannot recognize that request.

The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the process of discharging the Committee on Rules from further consideration of a bill that would rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services. This bill came from the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service on June 19 and has been pending before the Committee on Rules since that time. After the lapse of over 30 days, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH] filed a petition for discharge, and it is under that petition that we are working. Two hundred and eighteen Members of the House have signed it. They apparently knew what they were doing. Under the rule this matter will come before us tomorrow with adequate time to debate the merits of the bill. All that we are trying to do today is to bring this measure formally before the House.

DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCES NOW

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, Congress should restore dependency allowances at once. Thousands of National Guard men and Reservists are under orders to get their personal affairs in shape and to report for duty by September 1. Family men among them cannot arrange their personal affairs until they know what they can count on in the way of dependency allowances.

During World War II, Mr. Speaker, Congress established the principle that if we were going to draft married men or men with dependents we would set up a dependency allowance for their families so that to that extent, at least, his worries about his family would be lessened.

Today few married men may be drafted, but the very framework of most National Guard and reserve units is composed of GI veterans who were encouraged to establish homes when they returned from World War II. They have been buying houses, radios, refrigerators, automobiles on the installment plan. How will those payments be met and how will their families meet the grocery bills while the husbands and fathers are in camp? They deserve to know.

Mr. Speaker, if Members of Congress personally were under orders to arrange their personal affairs to report for military duty 2 weeks, or 3 weeks, or 4 weeks from today, we would want to know what our families could count on to meet bills while we were away.

Bills have been introduced to reestablish family allowances—H. R. 9262 in the House and S. 3986 in the other body. They were introduced July 27—nearly 3 weeks ago.

The family men are in the Reserve components now being called to duty. There should not be another day's delay. We should consider and pass the House bill at once and let these family men know what to count on.

Other bills important to the national defense have been expedited by the committee in charge, asking unanimous consent for consideration without waiting for customary reports and hearings. It seems to me the circumstances warrant that procedure in this instance. We should establish dependency allowances now.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, may I at this time defer to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] to use some of his time?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to use any time at present.

Mr. FULTON. I wish to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] on his generous action in yielding one-half of the time of the proponents of this legislation to me so that I can vigorously assist him in bringing up this resolution today. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 667 raises the question whether we will have good mail service in the United States of America or whether the mail service will continue at the snail's pace it has been moving under the Postmaster General's curtailment order of April 17, 1950.

As you all remember, the Postmaster General on behalf of the administration has cut down the mail delivery service from two deliveries a day, and we are now operating on a system that in some places does not even give the people adequate mail service. In most urban areas, this curtailment order of Postmaster General Donaldson has simply doubled the burden of the already overburdened carriers. Delay of mail has been caused to such an extent that there have been cartoons suggesting that people should send their messages by Indian drums instead of by post-office box. Abandoning of the directory service of looking up addresses has greatly affected postal deliveries. Users of mail service of second, third, or fourth class simply find the mail, in many places stacked in bundles, undelivered because of the physical impossibility of delivering it in a reasonable time under this curtailment order. There have been newspaper comments that the United States mail system and its efficiency in service, in spite of the valiant and uncomplaining efforts of loyal employees has reached its lowest point in many years.

The question today is, Shall we bring up and pass House Resolution 667 which will discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the bill rescinding the Postmaster General's order of April 17, 1950. Congress is certainly entitled to express its will on this legislation, instead of having the bill bottled by the Rules Committee after forthright action by the legislative committee, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, approving the bill and reporting it out.

Because I believe good mail service is good business, I will vote for this resolution.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I favor the adoption of the resolution to restore two-a-day mail deliveries in city residential areas and other mail services recently cut. In view of the fact that the American people will be called upon to pay a tax burden which may run to \$50,000,000,000 a year, if they want, and they have expressed themselves clearly both in my own and many other districts as wanting the kind of mail service they had before, then at the relatively small cost involved—estimates range from twenty-five to seventy million dollars per year—they ought to have it.

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. The Congress was blamed for this action under the guise of economy, this was not true. The Congress is only interested in efficiency in the Postal Department. This order by Mr. Donaldson was another example of the power of appointed people in Government.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the Postmaster General appeared before the House subcommittee on appro-

priations for the Post Office Department just a few weeks ago, he testified that he hoped to save fifteen to twenty-five million dollars through this order. I maintained then and I maintain now the order represents false economy. I maintain it hurts business and will impede the war effort. Witness the survey just taken of 500 industrial establishments in the city of New York and the conclusion that they have been hurt by this order. I cannot help but feel it will have a bad effect on the morale of our people in any delay in receipt of GI mail—getting home mail to the GI's or the GI mail to the home folks.

They hope for a saving of fifteen to twenty-five million dollars out of a \$2,300,000,000 appropriation. I shall always remember the day in November 1945, when the now Postmaster, then First Assistant Postmaster General, came before our subcommittee on appropriations to ask for a return to the two-delivery system, bogged down to one during the war, first, because the people of the United States were clamoring for it, and, secondly, because the post offices of this country were literally becoming warehouses congested with mail.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, we have a very specific responsibility as Members of the House of Representatives to instruct the Postmaster General to repeal the ill-considered orders that he issued on April 17. These orders have given the United States of America second-rate, inferior postal service at a time when we should have a speedy, efficient service. The Philadelphia Inquirer recently stated:

One of the twin evils besetting the postal service is a deterioration in service which would cause blushes of shame in a nation one-tenth the size of ours.

Continuing, the editorial declared:

Since the cuts in service ordered a few months ago as a means of reducing the postal deficit, complaints have mounted. Not only has residential service been reduced to one delivery a day, but there have been increasing criticisms of the service—or lack of it—in business areas.

Getting rid of the postal deficit is an important matter, and on that ground alone adoption of the Hoover reforms would be more than worth while.

By making it possible for the Post Office to function with the speed and efficiency that are doubly necessary in this emergency is of vital concern, too. It cannot do it, as the citizens' committee points out, with "hand-cranking equipment and methods." It could do the job, if Congress would end the blockade of postal reorganization, and get started on the Hoover reforms.

I do not think that we can properly emphasize the necessity of having fast, rapid, dependable communication. Having witnessed the results of having orders issued by the Postmaster General one is prone to think that the Postmaster General does not realize the importance of the service organization that he heads, and the absolute dependence that the citizens of the United States

place upon this great postal service. The postal service has always held a high place in the esteem of the American people. Recently we have been embarrassed by the complaints that have been appearing in the press around the country and by the complaints that have been made by individuals because of the service rendered.

The Lawrence Supply & Equipment Co., located in Tulsa, Okla., under date of July 1, 1950, were compelled to send the following letter, of which I hold a photostat in my hand, to their employees:

To all employees of Lawrence Supply & Equipment Co.

Subject: Delayed payroll.

On June 30, 1950, you requested that we pay your wages earned during the last half of June early in order that you and your families might arrange for recreation over Independence Day.

Your request was reasonable and it was a pleasure to pay early in order that you might celebrate the Fourth of July.

We were unable to comply with your request due to the fact that the mail service has been curtailed and the payroll was not received in this office in time to make out the checks and get them to you. I have ascertained that the payroll was mailed from Cushing in ample time and the delay is due directly to the curtailed postal service.

We regret that you and your families were inconvenienced in celebrating the Fourth of July, and assure you that so far as we are concerned the inconvenience was occasioned by the failure of Congress to insist on the Post Office Department giving adequate mail service.

J. R. LAWRENCE,
Partner.

Things like this never happened before. They should not happen now. We have a responsibility here to restore the Postal Service to the position of respect and confidence that it formerly enjoyed. I hold in my hand a postal card written by one R. Michael and mailed in Cleveland, Ohio. Mr. Michael writes as follows:

I mailed cards July 20 to my customers advising them that I would show the sample line at the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, on July 30-31. A number of customers did not show up and when I called on Pauline's Fashion Shop in Clairton, Pa., Mrs. Frenock told me that she received the card on August 1. On account of this delay in the mail service, I had to call a good many customers long distance, have to travel around to see them, lug around sample cases, and by the time I am through seeing them, a lot of goods will be sold out at an increase in price. Hoping that the regular service will be restored soon, I remain.

These are just a few of the complaints that have been made against the postal service since the orders issued by the Postmaster General.

I have an editorial here from the Cobb County Times published in Marietta, Ga., which reads as follows:

While postal officials are investigating complaints with respect to slow mail service made July 6 and 20 by this newspaper, new evidence indicates that poor service is not confined to Atlanta.

A local citizen has mailed to a Member of the other body a postcard which required 14 days to reach Denver, Colo., from Marietta. This citizen comments, "The Pony Express was giving better service 75 years ago than our mails are giving today."

This Member declares: "I regret the order of the Postmaster General curtailing postal service. * * * I am doing my best to have (him) revoke this order. * * * Legislation to rescind it is now on the Senate calendar. I will support the legislation."

Postal authorities insist the curtailment order has no connection whatsoever with the instances of slow service between Atlanta and Marietta. It is pointed out that the package complained of last week was actually fourth-class matter with special delivery postage. Whatever the classification, we see no reason why a special-delivery item should be 68 hours in transit between two cities only 20 miles apart.

These complaints clearly point out the action that we must take. We must take action here to restore the postal service. It is not a question of appropriation; it is essentially a question of maintaining in these United States of America a sound, dependable communication system. There are hundreds of economies that can be put into effect in the postal service. The Post Office Department has made no effort to modernize. A few years back a post-office clerk in the city of Chicago invented a machine for the distribution of mail. This machine has been examined and investigated by committees from this House, by the Trundle Commission and the Hoover Commission. It has been praised because of the efficiency with which it aids in the distribution of mail. However, despite the fact that the machine was first placed in operation several years ago, there is still only one machine operating. The trucks in use by the Post Office Department are a national disgrace. The difficulties of the Post Office Department are essentially difficulties of organization and management. We appreciate the fact that rates are probably not as high as they should be. We are also aware of the fact that the Postmaster General has it in his power to increase parcel-post rates to the point where parcel post is operated without any loss of revenue. He has failed to take this action, but instead of taking this action he has struck a blow at the very roots of good communication.

Communication is the artery of our country. It is the backbone of education. Through the channels of communication flow the lifeblood of commerce. Civilization is measured by the development and progress of good communication. But even the savage in the jungle realized that good communication was necessary and essential. The savage in the jungle used tom-toms to signal necessary messages. Man from the beginning of time has striven to speed up and improve communication. The Indian used smoke signals to advise of the advance of the foe. Man has always striven for better communication. We have moved forward in this country until the 17th of April, and by action of the Postmaster General our communication advance has been set back many, many years.

We have a serious responsibility here. We must take action. The Buffalo Evening News of June 14, 1950, carried a story wherein Mr. Ernest M. Hill, manager of Ellicott Square, stated that the delivery of mail is slower today than

it was in 1896. Even Broadway Columnist Ed Sullivan commenting in this daily column declared that mail deliveries have been wreaking havoc with mountain and resort reservations.

A feature article in the Chicago Daily News of July 10 carried the striking statement:

Drop it in a box after 7 p. m.; you would do better by ox cart.

It is futile for the Postmaster General to make statements that he has received few complaints. It is equally absurd for postmasters all over the United States to make similar statements. We have been advised by employees of post offices that complaints are constant. The mail service has sunk to the lowest level of public esteem. The Air Transportation publication carried a story under the title "Bottleneck on the Ground."

The Daily Herald-Telephone, of Bloomington, Ind., under date of July 13, declared:

The matter of postal service was aired at considerable length in April when the Indiana newspaper publishers met in Indianapolis. Newspapers near Indianapolis who are sending some of their copies through the capital city post office, said that as much as 4 days elapsed before the subscriber received his newspaper. Quite frequently here in Bloomington it takes 2 days to get a newspaper to or from Bedford.

The tragedy of the curtailment of mail service and what it has done to little people was described in an article written by Sylvia F. Porter and carried in many newspapers. The title of the article is "Delayed Letters" and it reads as follows:

The postcard read "1-day private sale, Monday, June 19. Drastic reductions on all goods in stock, we're clearing our shelves before going on vacation until July 4. Come early! Wonderful bargains!" That card arrived at my home yesterday afternoon, the 20th—almost a full day after the sale ended.

"So this is how the Post Office's economy drive is working out," I mumbled as I studied the ad and the postmark. "Here's one little businessman I'm going to interview."

When I walked into the shop (it's in my neighborhood), the owner was behind the counter, sorting boxes. No one else was in the store. I showed him the card, told him why I'd come.

"I know, I know," he moaned, "you're not the only one who has called me today to say they'd just received their notices. And I mailed them early last week. I've told everyone who has called that I'm extending the sale and to please come in. I've postponed my vacation and I'll stay open in the hope they'll come in."

"How did the sale go?" I asked.

"Fair," he said. "It wasn't much better than an ordinary day. And people around here, like you, always respond to my sales, don't you?" I nodded, he moaned again. "I don't know who got my cards, who didn't. I don't know how many customers I've lost, what the business might have been. Can't you do something? Can't you?"

The Wall Street Journal carried the story of one business firm that lost \$50,000 because of the fact that advertisements that they sent out were delayed. The situation relative to an inferior mail service requires prompt and immediate action.

I urge you to vote for the bill ordering the Postmaster General to rescind his orders.

Mr. CANFIELD. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. May I say in closing that in the hearing on this curtailment I asked the Postmaster General and his aides this question: Is it true that the British who pride themselves so much on their postal system are today maintaining two and more deliveries per day? The answer given was "Yes."

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, we have passed through two major wars without having such orders issued. The curtailment of the mail service put into effect by the Postmaster General was not a curtailment of a luxury. It was a curtailment of a vital service, short-sighted, poorly considered, and has cost the American people and American business a great deal more money than the small amount of savings that allegedly have been effected.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 8195 in the House of Representatives after a great deal of thought. I feel that the order issued by the Postmaster General under date of April 17 that appeared in the Postal Bulletin of April 18 was extremely ill advised. That order seriously curtailed not only the delivery of mail but the distribution and transmission of mail as well. It destroyed the directory service. Time was when if you mailed a letter and the party had moved, the Post Office Department saw that it was delivered to the party no matter where they had moved or when they had moved. Under the orders of the Postmaster General this service has been completely eliminated. An article in the New York Herald-Tribune of July 25, 1950, carried the information that dead letters have doubled since the cut of mail service. The economies made in the directory service are dissipated and spent in the dead-letter office and in returning letters to the senders.

The order is a mistake because it destroys efficient service. The system of multiple deliveries in use in the Post Office Department has been developed over the years as the most efficient way of handling mail. The distribution cases used by letter carriers hold a limited amount of mail. If more mail is placed in the case, efficiency is destroyed and economy with it. The same thing is true when it comes to delivery. If too much mail is placed upon the back of a letter carrier, his efficiency in handling the mail that he must deliver is materially reduced.

The orders issued by the Postmaster General provide that certain classes of mail can be handled only during limited

periods. This has resulted in an accumulation of mail in many post offices. The congestion has been expensive. There is only one way to economically deliver mail and that is to do it promptly and expeditiously. The pile-up is described in one of the Atlanta newspapers on the basis of a charge made by the editor of the Cobb County Times in Marietta, Ga. The item reads as follows:

Chess Abernathy, Jr., editor of the Cobb County Times, said Thursday a parcel mailed in Atlanta July 14 was 3 days in transit to Marietta in spite of the fact that its sender paid 96 cents first-class postage plus 45 cents special-delivery fee.

"This is 12 hours longer than the travel time of the parcel we complained about last week," Mr. Abernathy declared.

The editor's original complaint was that a package mailed to him in Atlanta June 18 did not complete the 20-mile trip to Marietta until June 21. Lon Livingston, Atlanta postmaster, issued a public statement that such delays "can't happen here."

The Cobb editor Thursday produced a package wrapper which he said supports his new charge. It bears a July 14, 1:30 p. m., Atlanta postmark and a Marietta postmark of July 17, 2:30 p. m.

Within 10 minutes after it was marked in Marietta, the package arrived at his office by special messenger, Mr. Abernathy said.

He added: "The charge that mail is piling up in the Atlanta post office is not a capricious one. We have had trouble with slow deliveries through Atlanta since 1946. Fourth-class mail usually requires 3 or 4 days to get here. Perhaps our chief mistake has been a failure to register more complaints."

There have been many complaints about costs placed upon the backs of individual businessmen because of this curtailment. Mark Sullivan, writing in the New York Herald Tribune, described the situation well when he stated:

These reductions are felt by every person who receives a letter or posts one, and even more by persons who send or receive packages. The sum of the effects is a slowing down of mail service, affecting literally everybody.

The people, as taxpayers, are to be saved some \$30,000,000. The people, as users of the postal service, are to be subjected to inconvenience, including some loss. It may be doubted whether the \$30,000,000 saved is equal to the loss in the carrying on of business. The aggregate of delays to letters and packages, affecting every individual and ramifying cumulatively into every line of business, can be seriously large.

An editorial in the Mining Journal, published in Marquette, Mich., refers to the order as "pound foolish" and declared "a slapdash reduction of service is not true economy. The country does not profit when letters that used to take 2 days to reach the recipient take 3 or 4. One might guess that the present slowdown costs businessmen and others many times the possible saving. It becomes supremely ridiculous when we fly mail at one-third the speed of sound and deliver it at the speed of an aging and discouraged turtle."

There have been hundreds and hundreds of statements relative to the curtailment of service and the effect it has upon business. I was much impressed with the letter, a copy of which I have in my hand, that was addressed to the

Postmaster General, which reads as follows:

We, a Government-approved manufacturer of high-frequency electronic equipment and supplies for the various United States Government agencies of military procurement, are greatly inconvenienced by the present delivery service.

Invitations to bid on equipment and supplies from Government procuring agencies arrive at our office in many instances too late in giving us sufficient time to prepare the bid and submit it by the required opening date.

We are in a residential neighborhood, in which is situated many types of small businesses, and under the circumstances, believe we deserve more than one mail delivery per day.

The importance of this letter increases with the development of a grave situation in Korea. The outcome of a war is dependent upon activity on the home front. In early days we had professional soldiers that lived on the land. Today for every soldier we have on the war front we require the work of a great many civilians to maintain that soldier. Production is a major part of war effort. Communication and delivery of materials are a major part of war effort.

I do know that the Post Office Department in some cities where complaints are made give the complainant special service. This is not the proper way to meet this situation. In America all the folks should be entitled to equal opportunity. A citizen by the name of J. B. Fite, living in Dallas, Tex., brought suit in the courts to compel the postmaster at Dallas to give him two deliveries a day. He maintained that it was discrimination in denying him that service. It is interesting to observe that the court upheld his contention.

We have many letters of complaint emphasizing the poor quality of service that is now being given under the curtailment orders of the Postmaster General. One of these letters is written from San Diego, Calif., by one Grover C. Matson who declares:

The mail service in our area right now is the poorest and most lax system of mail I have known in 55 years.

I have numerous letters here that describe how the cost of doing business has increased because of the curtailment. To quote one John J. Golden of Charlotte, N. C., a representative of a mill distributing underwear and hosiery:

At one time, most cities in my territory were overnight by mail from my home, Charlotte, N. C. Today because of the uncertainty of mail service, I find that I must depend on more expensive means of communication, wire, if I want to be certain of delivery.

The multiple-delivery service has been established through experience all over the world. It is the most efficient way of delivering mail. To establish this fact we can quote from the testimony of the present Postmaster General under date of July 7, 1947, when he appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, Eightieth Congress, first session, part I, Post Office Department, page 14:

The big increase in the volume of mail began to hit us with all kinds of complaints from postmasters, and from postal organizations, in March and April, particularly in

April. And I think it was more pronounced to us because in those months we were cutting expenditures and reducing the delivery service and the clerical service in not allowing postmasters as much money as they wanted for auxiliary expenditures. Reducing the cost with an increase in the volume of mail just flooded us with complaints not only from postmasters but from the public. We get anywhere from 3,000 to 5,000 letters in the run of a week from the public on curtailed postal service. But we did curtail drastically during May and June of this year in order to come within the amount appropriated.

We went back practically in every city in the country to a one-trip service in residential sections. I never thought in all of my years of experience that the public would complain so much about that, because I felt that the two-trip service in residential sections was more of a service function than just the public seeing the carrier come to the door twice a day. I know that our two-trip service was not based upon what the public needs in the way of having a carrier come to their door, but is based upon a prevention of delay in mail. So much mail arrives in these big cities at an hour in the morning when it cannot be distributed and get out to the stations from which the carriers emanate in time for delivery on the morning trip, and therefore, if we do not deliver it on the afternoon trip, it is delayed until the next morning.

Likewise, if you put carriers on a one-trip basis, we have got to determine whether he can handle his route on a basis of 8 hours within 10. It means that he must leave the office at 8 or 8:30 in the morning and he is continually on duty unless we swing him on his route somewhere, until his 8 hours are up. That means that some people do not get their mail during the morning and some people do not get it until as late as 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

I thought that there would not be so much kick about that until we began to do that during May and June and the people began to write us letters, because unless we can get that mail out in the afternoon delivery, it is delayed until the next morning. We have not been able even to begin to answer the complaints because we do not have enough force to handle that correspondence that has come in to us on account of this one-trip basis.

There you have a direct statement from the present Postmaster General as to what the effect of this curtailment is upon the people who receive the mail. I appeal to the Congress to vote in favor of my bill, H. R. 8195, ordering the Postmaster General to restore the postal service. It is essential to the safety of our country. It is essential to the economic welfare of thousands of our citizens. It is essential to the morale of our fighting forces and their folks at home.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I signed the discharge petition to bring this bill (H. R. 8195) to the House for action and therefore favor the approval of the action now before the House to discharge from the Rules Committee H. R. 8195 and to make it the first order of business tomorrow.

I have been opposed to the Postmaster's order reducing the delivery of mail to one a day ever since he put it into effect.

The reduction in the mail service has been resented by the public generally and now that we are engaged in a war it is necessary that the mail service be restored for the convenience of business

so that the war effort will not be impeded.

Why should we be limited to one mail delivery a day when many foreign countries receiving ECA funds have more than one mail delivery per day.

I favor this motion and I shall vote for H. R. 8195 when it comes up tomorrow.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 8195, to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services has a laudable purpose, but would we be quite realistic in passing it without also taking other legislation under consideration?

Before we pass this bill we should take action on several other bills dealing with the Post Office that are still in committee—notably H. R. 2908 separating air mail subsidies from payments for carrying air mail; bills to give the Postmaster General the right to fix fees for special services—money orders, special delivery, and so forth, so as to cover cost; H. R. 5643 with certain modifications perhaps—to modernize the Post Office set-up. Very definitely we should take another look at current rates—even as slightly raised by H. R. 2945—on second, third and fourth class mail and also consider changes in our economy forced upon us by the Korean situation.

Underlying the whole situation is the question Congress has never answered. Is the Post Office Department to be treated as a business or as a service?

On April 17, 1950, Postmaster General Jesse Donaldson, brought this question very clearly before the American people. He ordered mail deliveries in residential areas reduced to one a day; hours for window service shortened; fewer mailbox collections; and the abolition of the section which checked directories to assist in the delivery of poorly addressed mail. The Postmaster General at the same time stated that no regular civil-service employee would lose his job as a result of this order, but that it would affect substitutes and temporary workers.

WHY WAS THIS REDUCTION IN MAIL SERVICE ORDERED?

It was an attempt to bring costs more in line with revenue. The House Committee on Appropriations reduced the Post Office Department budget from \$2,235,607,000 requested by the President to \$2,207,500,000—cut of \$28,000,000. Also for the first time the appropriation bill as it passed the House limited the amount which could be drawn from the Treasury to offset any unforeseen deficit to considerably less than the current or anticipated deficit. Moreover, the House Appropriations Committee assumed the Post Office Department would have at least \$125,000,000 increased revenue from increased postal rates. While the House did pass a bill increasing rates, the Senate has not as yet acted on it. Since 74 percent of the expenditures of the Post Office Department goes for wages and salaries; 22 percent for transportation and 4 percent for equipment and facilities, it is evident that this reduction in budget necessitates a reduction in force.

SHOULD THE CUT IN THE SERVICE BE RESTORED?

Yes. But only if Congress will act to increase certain postal rates on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail; to separate the airline subsidies from the postal deficit; and to pass legislation which will enable the Postmaster General to make certain changes in the management of the Post Office. The Postmaster General has previously requested authority to make many of the reforms which the so-called Hoover Commission recommended.

The public and Congress must also decide whether or not they wish to subsidize the users of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail.

Certainly one thing is clear. Unless such action is taken the Postmaster General must not be criticized because the Department shows an annual deficit.

THE DEFICIT

The Post Office Department has run a deficit every year from 1923-42, inclusive. In 1943, 1944, and 1945 there was a surplus due to the great volume of first-class mail and due to the fact that overseas mail was carried by the military.

In 1946 the deficit was \$129,081,500. In 1949 it had grown to \$577,470,926. For 1950 it is estimated at about \$555,000,000.

WHY IS THERE A DEFICIT?

Neither Congress nor the public has ever decided whether the Post Office Department should be run as a business or as a tax-supported service. The deficit has long been criticized, but until recently no action has been taken to reduce it.

The Post Office Department is one of the world's largest businesses. It has a total revenue of \$1,700,000,000 a year, employs over half a million persons, and in a year transports and delivers more than 40,000,000,000 pieces of mail and handles over 800,000,000 transactions such as money orders, postal savings, and so forth.

As the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report points out, "a large part of this deficit is due to management factors for which neither the Postmaster General nor his staff can be held accountable within the present law."

Congress sets the postal rates and fixes the salaries of the employees. The Interstate Commerce Commission decides what should be paid to the railroads for transporting the mail. The Civil Aeronautics Board has the same power in regard to air carriers.

Since 1945 Congress has increased salaries of postal employees by \$740,000,000 per year. Prior to July 1, 1945, the average salary was \$1,950 per year; today, it is \$3,500.

The cost of rail and air transportation has gone up \$165,000,000 a year.

The Post Office Department performs services for other departments for which it receives little or no compensation. For example, it maintains a country-wide information service on civil service examinations; sells documentary stamps and savings bonds for the United States Treasury, and migrating-bird stamps for Interior.

THE AIR-MAIL SUBSIDY

The Civil Aeronautics Board determines what the Post Office Department

shall pay for air-mail transportation not only upon the basis of actual cost of the service plus a fair profit, but also on the basis of what the airlines need to stay in business. There are only estimates as to how much of the \$125,000,000 paid the airlines is for mail transportation and how much for subsidy. Estimates as to the subsidy vary from forty to sixty million dollars a year.

The Hoover Commission recommended that the airline subsidy should be handled quite separately from payment for carrying air mail and be paid out of direct appropriations to the Civil Aeronautics Board. H. R. 2908 provides for this action. It should be reported out of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the near future. I believe this bill should be passed without delay.

RAILROAD RATES

Railroad rates remained the same from July 1928 to 1947, when the ICC granted an interim increase of 25 percent. The railroads are asking for another 65-percent increase. The Postmaster General is fighting this further increase. The hearing is set for September 19, 1950.

The 25-percent increase cost the Post Office \$30,000,000 in 1947; \$40,000,000 in 1948; and \$44,000,000 in 1949. If the full 95 percent, retroactive to 1947, should be granted, the deficit for the next year is estimated at \$1,000,000,000 and the annual costs increased \$175,000,000 to \$200,000,000.

The ICC has interpreted the statutes regulating charges for railway cars—thirty-ninth United States Code, page 535—to mean that the Post Office Department must pay for the maximum space authorized in either direction for the round trip. S. 1596 would eliminate this so-called round-trip provision. Legislation to this end should be passed.

IMPROVEMENTS IN MANAGEMENT

The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report has claimed savings of \$200,000,000 a year could be achieved by better management. This figure is questioned by the Postmaster General and others familiar with the details of the Post Office Department, but some savings can be made.

The Postmaster General has pointed out that there is not a single post office in the United States that has space adequate for the handling of the increasing volume of mail and that no railroad furnishes adequate space in any large city terminal. He also notes that machinery cannot be used as in a factory; no machine can read an address. However, mechanical sorting equipment, according to Mr. Donaldson, has been installed to a far greater degree than in the private express companies. Parcel post window service is being mechanized in some 100 cities with the new postage meter. Efforts are being made to devise workable ramps, conveyor belts, and so forth, and to improve the so-called walk-in trucks. Public 231—Eighty-first Congress—provides for a research and development program in the Post Office Department to study equipment, supplies, methods, and procedures of the postal service.

Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950 believes the Post Office of building manage-

ment responsibilities not directly related to its work and puts such responsibilities under General Services Administration.

FISCAL PROCEDURES

The Post Office Department operates under 59 separate congressional appropriations ranging from \$3,000 to \$500,000,000 each. This requires the Postmaster General to make up a separate budget estimate for each of the 58 inter-related functions. Each dollar spent must be charged against a specific appropriation and transfers from one account to another are permitted only within narrow limits. This prevents the Department from operating as a fiscal unit and makes it impossible to get a complete picture of its total operations. There should be a more unified budget.

It is also confusing that the accounts of the Post Office Department are audited by the General Accounting Office at Asheville, N. C. H. R. 8923 which passed the House July 3, 1950, and the Senate last week, transfers this accounting function to the Post Office Department. This bill would also require separate accounts for free services performed for other departments, franked mail, and cost of air services in excess of air-mail revenue so these can be deducted to eliminate the strict and unnecessary separation of minor accounts in each of 42,000 post offices. Site audits will be permitted and also the use of spot checks now used in business. The necessity of shipping truckloads of vouchers to Asheville will be eliminated.

RATES

Postal rates bear little relation to cost. Rates were increased slightly in 1947 to bring in an additional \$110,000,000 a year. The Postmaster General has asked for higher rates each year since 1948. H. R. 2945 which passed the House this year increased rates to bring in an additional \$131,000,000 a year. No action has as yet been taken on it in the Senate.

A bill was introduced to give the Postmaster General the right to fix fees for special services—money orders, postal notes, special delivery, registered and c. o. d. mail—so as to cover costs. This is in accord with Hoover Commission recommendations. It would make only a small dent in the deficit. No action has been taken on this bill.

The Postal Savings Division is self-supporting. On money orders there is a loss of \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 a year.

There are four classes of mail: first class, letters, postcards, and air mail; second class, newspapers, magazines, and periodicals with bona fide subscription lists; third class, circulars and parcels up to 8 ounces; fourth class, all parcels 8 ounces or more, books and catalogs.

First class letters bring in net revenue. It costs 2.6 cents to print and deliver a penny postcard. Over 90 percent are used for advertising or other business purposes. The House bill raised the postage on them to 2 cents. Even so the deficit here would be \$29,000,000 a year.

There is considerable feeling that second class rates should be increased beyond the moderate raise in the current

House bill; notably on the advertising carried in the periodicals. The rates are substantially the same as in 1879 when second-class mail was established. The Eightieth Congress refused to make any increase on second-class mail and there is strong pressure from publishers to retain the low rate. H. R. 2945 made some slight increase, but the deficit would still be some \$160,000,000 a year, according to the best estimates.

The Postmaster General has recommended an increase on third class which is in the main advertising. The deficit after the increase of H. R. 2945 would still be about \$106,000,000. Bulk mailing is now 1 cent per piece; the new rate would be 1½ cents.

The Postmaster General estimates that costs in excess of revenue for second-, third-, and fourth-class mail are equivalent to a subsidy of \$435,000,000 a year—approximately \$200,000,000 for second class, \$135,000,000 for third class, and \$100,000,000 for fourth class.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

First. The Postmaster General should not be an official of a political party.

(a) Mr. Donaldson, a career man, was appointed by President Truman before the Hoover Commission report was released.

Second. Recommendations for reorganization have been put into effect by the Postmaster General through:

(a) The appointment of a Deputy Postmaster General.

(b) Reassignment of duties to the Assistant Postmaster Generals and heads of divisions.

(c) The creation of an Advisory Board representing various elements of the public.

Third. Improvements in fiscal procedure.

(a) H. R. 8923 has passed the Congress.

Fourth. Airline subsidies paid by direct appropriation to Civil Aeronautics Board.

(a) Legislation now in committee should be passed at this session.

Fifth. Increase in rates:

(a) Bill has passed House and is now in the Senate. There should be a greater increase on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail. And special services should be charged at cost.

Sixth. Eliminate Senate confirmation of Postmasters and political nominations of rural carriers.

(a) S. 2213 would do this. No action has been taken on this bill. While the acceptance of this recommendation would eliminate a burden on Congressmen, from my observation of postmasters in eastern Connecticut—men and women appointed under various administrations—I question if career service appointments could produce more efficient personnel.

Seventh. The Commission recommended consolidation of post offices. It is pointed out that the result would be economy and improved services.

(a) In conformance with this recommendation I have cooperated with the Department in closing four small post offices in the Second Congressional District. In each case the office was closed with no one thrown out of a job and with

improved mail delivery service to the patrons and savings in costs.

In brief, the cut in the mail service has brought into the open the questions of mail rates and subsidies and the post office deficits which should be dealt with by the Congress not piecemeal but as a whole so that the public may get the best possible mail service at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, attempts will probably be made here this afternoon to say this curtailment order was made necessary by the situation that has developed as a result of the war in Korea.

We will do well to keep in mind that not only was the Postmaster General's order issued without consultation with Congress or the House or Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees, but it was issued on April 18, 1950, before the President or any of his so-called experts apparently had any knowledge of the blow that was impending.

Thus to stretch the origin of this postal curtailment order into the Korean situation must necessarily take a considerable stretching of the imagination.

An order of the Nation-wide ramifications of this one deserves the attention of all Members of the House. Whether for or against this particular decree of an appointed Federal official, it will do no harm to debate it tomorrow here on the floor.

I certainly intended to support the action that has been taken to bring his proposal out for debate and a vote.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I personally introduced a bill, H. R. 8505, similar to the one which we will consider tomorrow, to rescind the Postmaster General's order to curtail residential mail delivery service, because of my intense conviction this order was an unjust imposition upon the average taxpayer and would not result in an improvement of postal efficiency; in fact, I earnestly feel it has promoted inefficiency.

Without question, one of the most essential of all Government services, to the ordinary citizen, as well as the business firms, is the Post Office Department. In my opinion, the average person and family in this country has just as much right to expect and receive prompt delivery of personal mail as any department store, industrial plant, bank, or business.

In studying this subject, I found that during Post Office Committee hearings, back in November of 1945, the year of the Axis surrender, there was a Nation-wide demand for the restoration of the twice daily delivery and that the heads of the Post Office Department all testified that such resumption was necessary to avoid congestion and confusion in the post office and keep the mail properly moving. I have also ascertained that even in Britain, with all their austerity in present day living, the Government, recognizing the prime importance of the postal service to the people, maintains a two-delivery-per-day system.

The order, at best, is certainly a very doubtful economy move. In most districts, the mailmen were already carrying maximum loads and the only way of attempting to eliminate the second delivery, without permitting the mail to

pile up in the post office, is to shorten the route or put two men on the job at the same time. This appears to be cutting the service without any material reduction in cost; in fact it has a tendency to increase costs.

I should like to remind you that, with the Korean war and the expanding military mobilization, prompt and efficient residential mail delivery service is vitally necessary for the maintenance of a high morale in the people of this country and is in the best interests of our national welfare.

I earnestly hope this House will act promptly tomorrow to rescind the postal delivery curtailment order and give back to our citizens the full service to which they are rightfully entitled.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this means of going on record before the Congress and the people of the United States in opposition to the curtailment of postal services instituted by Postmaster General Donaldson on April 17, 1950.

Mr. Donaldson's order has cut residential mail deliveries from two to one a day. Many persons now get their mail in the afternoon instead of in the morning, as in the past. Collections from boxes have been curtailed, deliveries in business districts have been reduced by one delivery on Saturdays, post-office windows are closed at 5:30 p. m., and parcel-post deliveries are limited to one a day.

The issuing of this order by the Postmaster General about-faces the traditional policy of our Government by not recognizing that the Post Office Department was established as a service institution and that it was never intended to be operated on a pay-as-you-go basis. Postal service should not be used as a revenue-producing means. It should be conducted for service only. There is no denying the fact that this great governmental agency has done more to develop our Nation than any other governmental agency. Notwithstanding the known accomplishments of the Post Office Department, the Postmaster General arbitrarily issued this sweeping and drastic order.

It has been stated that most of the employees who have been affected by curtailed employment are veterans. According to some persons, many of them are 10-point disabled veterans. These postal employees, most of whom are low-paid substitute workers, were on the receiving end of the brunt of this directive.

The resulting unemployment is a severe blow to the morale of the postal workers. Mr. Philip Lepper, president of the New York branch of the Association of Letter Carriers, AFL, declared that the order had thrown panic into the hearts of the letter carriers in his organization.

Likewise, David Silvergled, president of the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees of Greater New York and Vicinity, stated that—

The American people are entitled to the continuance and maintenance of the best postal service in the world. This order will not only disrupt the postal service as we have always known it, but will destroy all feelings of security on the part of its faithful employees.

The daily mail is the backbone of our communication system. The demand and need for postal service is now greater than ever. It is a Government function that has become essential to the growth and economic well-being of our country. It is unfair to deny our people the service they want and the service to which they have become accustomed. It is unjust to throw faithful employees out of work when they are providing such a service.

The curtailment of postal service has resulted in sizeable money losses to American business. There is a story of one business firm that lost \$50,000 because of the fact that advertisements that they sent out were delayed. This situation relative to an inferior mail service requires prompt and immediate action.

The cut proposed by the House of Representatives in postal appropriations amounts to \$28,107,000 or a little over 1 percent of the total requested budget. It does not seem reasonable that this small a cut would warrant such a sweeping reduction in employment and in service.

There are other ways to save money than to fire forty-dollar-a-week postal workers, most of whom are veterans. For example, some of the postal subsidies could be reduced or Congress could provide the sum of money requested. In speaking of subsidies, the Postmaster General has called attention to the \$200,000,000 subsidy to second-class mail. In addition, the Post Office Department's budget supports a fifty- to sixty-million-dollar air mail subsidy. Last year, third-class mail was subsidized to the extent of \$129,000,000 and fourth-class mail was subsidized in the amount of \$90,000,000. Our foreign mail costs \$74,000,000 more than the revenue generated from this service. We do not have to fire forty-dollar-a-week clerks to save money—there are better ways to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge restoration of jobs to the faithful postal employees and the restoration of the excellent services of the Post Office Department to which we have all so properly become accustomed.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I shall withhold any statement I desire to make.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time under the rule to close.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire any time?

Mr. COX. Yes. Has the gentleman concluded his statement? If the gentleman means to take any more time, I think he should take it now. He should not be permitted to split his 10 minutes up.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman from California, author of the motion, is entitled to close the debate.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the vote taken on the motion to adjourn means that Members voting in the negative purpose to support the resolution vacating the order of the Postmaster General, then the vote reflected a sorry concern for the state of the Nation. I trust, however, Mr. Speaker, that the vote means nothing more than a willingness or a purpose on the part of the member-

ship to meet this question head-on and to make final decision on it.

Mr. Speaker, it is a cruel and a mean fear that brings this discharge petition here for consideration. Think of it! Here when we are in a state of war, this branch of the Congress is found playing politics. The Postmaster General in making this order did not act capriciously. He moved in this instance as a result of pressure brought to bear upon him by this body. Your Committee on Appropriations said on April 17:

The committee has discussed with the Postmaster General certain proposals for effecting economies, and realizes that probably all of the suggestions made will provoke some complaints from one source or another. Nevertheless, the financial condition of the United States Treasury is such that every step possible must be taken to save money.

The committee believes that sizable savings could be made by a reduction of the number of deliveries per day to many areas, particularly on those routes serving residential areas exclusively. Residential areas receive from one to three deliveries a day; rural patrons receive one delivery a day. The committee urges the Postmaster General to provide for the rearrangement of city delivery service so as to reduce the number of deliveries wherever possible.

Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the Postmaster General was a rational move made by him and in the report that he made in a letter of Saturday last, he makes disclosure that the order saves the Treasury \$70,000,000 annually—not \$15,000,000 as was stated a while ago; not some indefinite sum as has been stated, but saves the Treasury \$70,000,000 annually.

Of the 218 signers on this discharge petition, 110 voted for the Taber-Thomas amendment to the appropriation bill, which ordered a reduction of 10 percent in all nondefense appropriations. Gentlemen taking the floor this morning who voted for that amendment seem to have reversed themselves. This House is here given its first opportunity for making public expression of its views on the question of economy.

Mr. Speaker, of the more than 41,000 post offices, only 4,000 have city delivery. Over 23,000,000 people live in towns that have no delivery whatever. Above 32,000,000 people live on rural routes. The figures that I have given are taken from the communication that Mr. Donaldson sent to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] on Saturday last.

The Postmaster General says that during World War II above 70 percent of those in residential areas got only one mail delivery per day due to the shortage of manpower. Now, Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are actually at war, there comes this petition to discharge the Committee on Rules because it could not see its way clear to report this resolution to the House. Mr. Speaker, is it a kind of cold fear creeping through the minds of Members, freezing their understanding, that makes possible the doing of that which is here proposed? Should not responsible people find it possible to subordinate their own political welfare for the good of their country? To me it is unthinkable that we should overthrow the Postmaster General, and I am

ashamed of those who are responsible for this petition being brought here, and I trust that Members of this body will find it pleasing to meet this question courageously, and in the light of what they know to give true answer to the question proposed.

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

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I just want to remind the gentleman that 109 veterans of our wars signed that petition.

Mr. COX. I do not care how many veterans signed the petition. They were wrong and should here make amends.

Mr. CANFIELD. They knew what they were doing.

Mr. COX. If the Members will read the letter of the Postmaster General in which he makes a dispassionate sort of report, one which is completely convincing, they cannot in my judgment, with any approval of their sense of right, vote to override the order here involved. The order of the Postmaster General should stand.

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

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Georgia. I agree with the statements that he has made. We are going at this thing backward. What we should do is appropriate enough money to enable the Postmaster General to carry out the laws passed by the Congress.

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman. He is completely right.

Mr. Speaker, we are meeting this issue under extraordinary circumstances. The minority voted a few minutes ago almost solidly against adjournment. Maybe they were right—maybe they were right. They have been pleading for economy. Of course in that respect I know they were right. But what are they doing now? I trust that when the vote is taken on this issue, their conduct will accord with their words. Maybe this presents a test of their good faith. It is by its fruit that the tree must be judged.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to yield time?

Mr. COX. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be one of those who helped bring this matter into the open and to have signed the petition to discharge the Committee on Rules from what I conceive to have been its apparent duty, to grant a rule on this bill. The Legislative Committee acted upon favorably. I am not scared by this great cry for economy which the gentleman preceding me just made. The House of Representatives is responsible for the kind of service that the Post Office gives. We lay down the rule as to the duties and services of the Post Office Department, then we cut the heart out of them with inadequate appropriations.

I would like to see any Member of the House next January justify to the man with the postal bag over his shoulder, walking out in the snow, munching his lunch because he does not have the time

to sit down and eat it the way the people in this country are supposed to eat lunch. Why, Mr. Speaker, there is not an organized craft in this country where the union of that craft would allow its people to be treated the way this order will treat the members of the postal service and the letter carriers in particular.

All we are trying to do is to bring this matter before the House so that on tomorrow, under the rule, the House will have an opportunity to discuss the whys and wherefores and go into it more fully. I ask the Members who have had the courage to sign this discharge petition to stick with their first and sound decision.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of House Resolution 667, providing for the consideration of H. R. 8195, a bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee) there were—ayes 159, noes 146.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 249, nays 81, answered "present" 3, not voting 97, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

YEAS—249

Addonizio	Crosser	Hays, Ohio
Albert	Cunningham	Hébert
Allen, Calif.	Curtis	Hedrick
Allen, Ill.	Dague	Heffernan
Allen, La.	Davenport	Heller
Andresen	Davis, Tenn.	Heseltun
August H.	DeGraffenried	Hill
Angell	Delaney	Holmes
Arends	Dollinger	Horan
Aspinall	Dolliver	Howell
Auchincloss	Donohue	Huber
Bailey	Douglas	Hull
Barling	Doyle	Irving
Barrett, Pa.	Elliott	Jackson, Calif.
Bates, Mass.	Ellsworth	Jackson, Wash.
Battle	Elston	Javits
Beall	Engle, Calif.	Jenison
Beckworth	Evins	Jennings
Bennett, Fla.	Fallon	Jensen
Bennett, Mich.	Feighan	Jones, N. C.
Biemiller	Fellows	Judd
Bishop	Fenton	Karst
Blatnik	Flood	Karsten
Boggs, La.	Fogarty	Kean
Bolling	Forand	Kearney
Bolton, Md.	Fulton	Kearns
Bolton, Ohio	Gamble	Keating
Bosone	Garmatz	Kee
Bramblett	Gavin	Kelley, Pa.
Breen	Gilmer	Kelly, N. Y.
Brooks	Golden	Keogh
Brown, Ga.	Goodwin	Kilday
Bryson	Gordon	King
Buchanan	Gorski	Kirwan
Buckley, Ill.	Graham	Klein
Buckley, N. Y.	Granahan	Kruse
Burdick	Granger	Kunkel
Burke	Grant	Lane
Burnside	Green	Larcade
Byrne, N. Y.	Gross	LeCompte
Canfield	Guill	LeFevre
Carnahan	Gwinn	Lichtenwalter
Case, N. J.	Hagen	Lind
Celler	Hall	Linehan
Chesney	Edwin Arthur	Love
Christopher	Halleck	McCarthy
Chudoff	Hand	McConnell
Clemente	Harden	McDonough
Cole, Kans.	Hardy	McGrath
Corbett	Harris	McGregor
Cotton	Hart	McGuire
Coudert	Harvey	McKinnon
Crook	Havenner	McSweeney

Mack, Wash.	Peterson	Sheppard
Madden	Pfeiffer	Short
Mansfield	Joseph L.	Simpson, Ill.
Marsalis	Philbin	Simpson, Pa.
Martin, Iowa	Phillips, Calif.	Smith, Wis.
Martin, Mass.	Plumley	Spence
Marrow	Poulson	Staggers
Meyer	Price	Steed
Miles	Priest	Sullivan
Miller, Calif.	Rabaut	Tackett
Miller, Md.	Rains	Tauriello
Mitchell	Ramsay	Taylor
Monroney	Reed, Ill.	Tollefson
Morris	Reed, N. Y.	Van Zandt
Morrison	Rhodes	Wagner
Moulder	Ribicoff	Walter
Multer	Riehlman	Welch
Murdock	Rivers	Welch
Murphy	Rodino	White, Calif.
Nicholson	Rogers, Fla.	Widnall
Norrell	Rogers, Mass.	Wier
Norton	Rooney	Wigglesworth
O'Brien, Ill.	Sadiak	Wilson, Ind.
O'Brien, Mich.	St. George	Wilson, Okla.
O'Hara, Minn.	Sasscer	Withrow
O'Konski	Saylor	Wolverton
O'Neill	Scott, Hardie	Woodhouse
O'Sullivan	Scudder	Woodruff
O'Toole	Secrest	Yates
Patterson	Shafer	Young
Perkins	Shelley	Zablocki

NAYS—81

Abbitt	Fugate	Poage
Abernethy	Gary	Polk
Andersen	Gathings	Preston
H. Carl	Gossett	Rankin
Anderson, Calif.	Gregory	Rees
Andrews	Hale	Richards
Bates, Ky.	Harrison	Robeson
Bentsen	Hays, Ark.	Scrivner
Bonner	Herlong	Sikes
Burleson	Hobbs	Sims
Burton	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hope	Stigler
Camp	Jacobs	Stockman
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Sutton
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, Mo.	Taber
Chelf	Kerr	Teague
Colmer	Kilburn	Thomas
Combs	McCulloch	Thompson
Cooper	McMillan, S. C.	Thornberry
Cox	Mahon	Trimble
Davis, Ga.	Marshall	Wheeler
Davis, Wis.	Michener	Whitaker
Deane	Miller, Nebr.	Whitten
Doughton	Mills	Whittington
Durham	Murray, Tenn.	Wilson, Tex.
Eberhart	Norblad	Wood
Fisher	Passman	
Ford	Patman	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Lyle	McCormack	Noland
------	-----------	--------

NOT VOTING—97

Barden	Hinshaw	Powell
Barrett, Wyo.	Hoever	Quinn
Blackney	Hoffman, Ill.	Redden
Boggs, Del.	Holifield	Regan
Boykin	James	Rich
Brehm	Jenkins	Roosevelt
Brown, Ohio	Johnson	Sabath
Bulwinkle	Jonas	Sadowski
Carlyle	Keefe	Sanborn
Carroll	Kennedy	Scott
Cavalcante	Lanham	Hugh D., Jr.
Chatham	Latham	Smathers
Chiperfield	Lodge	Smith, Kans.
Cleaver	Lucas	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Lynch	Stanley
Cooley	McMillen, Ill.	Stefan
Crawford	Mack, Ill.	Talle
Davies, N. Y.	Macy	Towe
Dawson	Magee	Underwood
Denton	Marcantonio	Velde
D'Ewart	Mason	Vinson
Dingell	Morgan	Vorys
Dondero	Morton	Vursell
Eaton	Murray, Wis.	Wadsworth
Engel, Mich.	Nelson	Walsh
Fernandez	Nixon	Ward
Frazier	O'Hara, Ill.	White, Idaho
Furcolo	Pace	Wickersham
Gillette	Patten	Williams
Gore	Pfeiffer	Willis
Hall	William L.	Winstead
Leonard W.	Phillips, Tenn.	Wolcott
Hare	Pickett	
Herter	Potter	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. McCormack against.
Mr. Lodge for, with Mr. Morton against.
Mr. Walsh for, with Mr. Noland against.
Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Rich against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Pickett with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Marcantonio with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Williams with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Chipfield.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.
Mr. Carroll with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. James.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Stefan.
Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Nixon.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Smathers with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Stanley with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Lucas with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Furcolo with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Sanborn.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Talle.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Velde.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BROWN. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. WALSH. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

* Resolved, That upon the day succeeding the adoption of this resolution, a special order be, and is hereby, created by the House of Representatives for the consideration of H. R. 8195. That on said day the Speaker shall recognize the Representative from Indiana, JOHN R. WALSH, to call up H. R. 8195, a bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services, as a special order of business, and to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of said H. R. 8195. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Member of the House requesting the rule for the consideration of said H. R. 8195 and the Member of the House who is opposed to the said H. R. 8195, to be designated by the Speaker, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, and the amendments thereto, to final passage, without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit. The special order shall be a continuing order until the bill is finally disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN MICHAEL ANCKER RASMUSSEN—
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF
THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 683)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (H. R. 3464) to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of alien John Michael Ancker Rasmussen.

The bill would direct the Attorney General to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of John Michael Ancker Rasmussen as of July 22, 1948, if he is otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. It would also direct the Secretary of State to instruct the quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate immigration quota.

The record discloses that Mr. Rasmussen is a native and citizen of Denmark, having been born in that country on April 25, 1918. Coming from China, where he had resided since 1919, he entered the United States at the port of San Francisco, on July 22, 1948, when he was admitted as a temporary visitor for a period of 6 months. Although his mother and sister were subsequently admitted to this country for permanent residence, Mr. Rasmussen's wife and two minor children, who left China in 1947, now reside in Sweden with relatives. According to last information, Mr. Rasmussen resides in Washington, D. C., where he is employed in a department store.

The alien was granted an extension of his temporary stay until March 21, 1949, and he should be required to depart in accordance with the terms under which he was granted admission to this country. The quota of Denmark, to which he is chargeable, is oversubscribed and an immigration visa in his case is not readily obtainable. In this respect his case is not unlike those of many other aliens

who are awaiting an opportunity to come to this country for permanent residence, and the record fails to present considerations justifying the enactment of special legislation granting him a preference over such others. The enactment of this bill would undoubtedly encourage other aliens to attempt to enter the United States as visitors for a temporary period and, thereafter, seek exemption from the requirements of the immigration laws.

Accordingly, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 14, 1950.

MRS. VIRGINIA DALLA ROSA PRATI—
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 685)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (H. R. 5016) for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Dalla Rosa Prati and her minor son, Rolando Dalla Rosa Prati.

The bill would provide that Mrs. Virginia Dalla Rosa Prati and her minor son, Rolando Dalla Rosa Prati, shall be considered lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entries, upon payment of the required head taxes and visa fees. The measure also would direct the Secretary of State to instruct the quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate immigration quotas.

The record discloses that Mrs. Dalla Rosa Prati was born in San Francisco, Calif., on December 13, 1906. In 1933 she went to Italy, renounced her United States citizenship, and became a naturalized citizen of Italy, so that she and Mr. Rolando Dalla Rosa Prati, a vice consul of Italy, then stationed in California, could be married in accordance with the Italian regulations in effect at that time. Her minor son, Rolando Dalla Rosa Prati, was born in Bucharest, Rumania, on April 25, 1939, while his father was serving in the Italian consular service in that city. Mrs. Dalla Rosa Prati and her son entered the United States at the port of Miami, Fla., on September 10, 1944, when they were admitted for a period of 1 year. After remaining in this country for a longer time than was authorized under the terms of their admission, they departed from the United States on May 31, 1949, returning to Italy. They subsequently entered the United States at the port of New York on September 5, 1949, when they were admitted under section 3 (1) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as the wife and son of a diplomat. So long as they maintain such status they may remain in this country indefinitely.

Mrs. Dalla Rosa Prati voluntarily surrendered her United States citizenship with knowledge of the consequences of

her act. The quotas of Italy and Rumania, to which she and her minor son are chargeable, are oversubscribed and quota immigration visas are not readily obtainable. Their case does not present considerations justifying the enactment of special legislation granting them a preference over the many other aliens in Italy and Rumania who also desire to come to the United States as quota immigrants for permanent residence.

Accordingly I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 14, 1950.

DR. FRANCESCO DRAGO—MESSAGE FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 684)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4806, for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago.

The bill would provide that, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee, Francesco Drago will be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on May 19, 1948. It would also direct the Secretary of State to instruct the quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate immigration quota.

The record discloses that Francesco Drago, a medical doctor, is a native and citizen of Italy, having been born in Palermo, Italy, on December 22, 1920. He entered the United States at the port of Philadelphia on May 20, 1948, when he was admitted as a visitor under section 3 (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924, until July 19, 1948. Dr. Drago has been employed as a voluntary fellow in medicine at the University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., attached to the staff of the tuberculosis service of the Edward J. Meyer Memorial Hospital. He is not married and is supported by an uncle in this country.

Extensions of Dr. Drago's temporary stay have been permitted pending the outcome of this legislation, upon which final action by the Congress was not taken until after Dr. Drago had become so seriously ill as to require an extended period of hospitalization. While he is still confined to the hospital there is good prospect for his complete recovery.

Under all of the circumstances present in this case, I believe that it would be unfair to the United States and to Dr. Drago as well, if I were to approve this bill. Therefore, while I feel obliged to withhold my approval from this measure, I am requesting the Department of Justice to permit a further extension of Dr. Drago's stay in the United States until such time as the outcome of his illness can be more certainly determined. If restoration to health should be complete, I would have no objection to approval of a measure waiving such

provisions of the immigration laws as might be necessary to permit him to take up permanent residence in the United States.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 14, 1950.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LYNCH (at the request of Mr. McCormack) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALIFORNIA WORLD PROGRESS EXPOSITION

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 434) providing for recognition and endorsement of the California World Progress Exposition, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "the" where it appears the first time and insert "foreign."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "of the democratic world."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this merely provides for a change in the phraseology, does it not?

Mr. KEE. That is all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3666) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2911)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3666) to extend for five years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, having

met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
LESTER C. HUNT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3666) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill and the House amendment both provided for a 5-year extension in the operation by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the Government-owned Texas City Tin Smelter. In addition the House amendment included a proviso reciting that the powers, functions, duties, and authority vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by section 2 of Public Law 125, Eightieth Congress, as amended, be exercised with due regard to the public interest in the maintenance of domestic smelting of Western Hemisphere tin ores and concentrates by American private enterprise.

The committee of conference recognizes the public interest in the maintenance and encouragement of domestic smelting of Western Hemisphere tin ores and concentrates by American private enterprise and expects that such powers, functions, duties, and authority will be exercised with due regard to this interest. The committee of conference unanimously agreed however that, at this time, our primary interest is to guarantee an adequate supply of tin to meet the needs of national security for this country, and that the Government should continue to seek necessary supplies of tin ores and concentrates wherever they are available.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

DE SOTO NATIONAL MEMORIAL, FLORIDA

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8230) to amend the act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida, with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out lines 6, 7, and 8 and insert:

"Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$50,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABANDONED SCHOOL PROPERTIES IN THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2121) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey abandoned school properties in the Territory of Alaska to local school officials, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 6 to 16 inclusive, and insert "and shall provide that the lands and improvements conveyed shall be used for school or other public purposes only and that the school facilities maintained thereon or therein shall be available to all of the native children of the town, city, or other school district concerned on the same terms as to other children of such town, city, or district. The Secretary of the Interior, if at any time he determines that the grantee of any such lands and improvements has violated or failed to observe the foregoing provisions and that such violation or failure has continued for a period of at least one year, may declare a forfeiture of the grant. Such determination by the Secretary shall be final, and thereupon the lands and improvements covered thereby shall revert to the United States and become a part of the public domain subject to administration and disposal under the public land laws."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the Hungry Horse Road.

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

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Reserve Officers' magazine.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article by Jan Ciechanowski from the Boston Herald of Sunday, August 13.

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of a letter from a constituent.

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

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

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

Mr. LeCOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the Reverend Monsignor Vitus Stoll, of Creston, Iowa, which appeared in the Des Moines Register.

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

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

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make on the bill S. 192 and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day.

REGULATING BARBERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R.

7240) to amend sections 12 and 14 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938 (sec. 2-1112-1114, D. C. Code, 1940 edition), and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 12 and 14 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938 (sec. 2-1112-1114, D. C. Code, 1940 edition), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 12. The Commissioners are authorized and directed to provide suitable quarters for examinations and equipment to the Board and for the compensation of the members of the Board at the rate of \$20 per day for the time actually and necessarily spent in their duties as such members, and for the payment of expenses necessarily incurred by the Board in carrying out the provisions of this act and are also authorized and directed to appoint a clerk and three inspectors at such salary as the Commissioners may authorize to assist the Board in carrying out the provisions of this act; said inspectors shall be qualified barbers, each of whom shall have been engaged in the practice of barbering in the District of Columbia for a period of 5 years immediately prior to their appointment, and shall be appointed after a competitive examination held for said positions by the Board officer of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That payments under this section shall not exceed the amount received from the fees provided for in this act; and if at the close of each fiscal year any funds unexpended in the excess of the sum of \$1,000 shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That no expense incurred under this act shall be a charge against the funds of the United States or the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 14. (a) To fail to list prices of services rendered to the public during the week and Sundays, and such list of prices shall be kept posted in a conspicuous place not more than 5 feet above the floor."

"(b) Any person violating any of the provisions or regulations of this act shall upon conviction be fined not less than \$25 or more than \$200."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Amendment No. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 12 of the act entitled 'An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved June 7, 1938 (52 Stat. 622)), be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 12. The Commissioners are authorized and directed to provide suitable quarters for the Board. The compensation of each member of the Board, other than the secretary-treasurer, shall be fixed by the Commissioners at not to exceed \$20 for each day actually and necessarily spent in their duties as such members: *Provided*, That the total compensation payable to each such member shall not exceed \$600 per annum. The Commissioners are also authorized and directed to appoint such clerks, inspectors, and other personnel as they deem to be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That such inspectors shall be qualified barbers,

each of whom shall have been engaged in the practice of barbering in the District of Columbia for a period of 5 years immediately prior to their appointment and shall be appointed after a competitive examination held for said positions by the Board. Compensation of such clerks, inspectors, and other personnel including the secretary-treasurer of the Board, shall be fixed by the Commissioners. Payments for expenses of the Board, including those authorized by this section, shall not exceed the amount received from the fees provided for in this act; and if at the close of any fiscal year there be any funds unexpended in excess of the sum of \$1,000 such excess shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That no expense incurred under this act shall be a charge against the funds of the United States or the District of Columbia."

"Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 14 of such act is amended by striking therefrom 'not less than \$25' and inserting in lieu thereof 'not more than \$200.'"

"Sec. 3. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized by regulation to require the owner or the manager of every barber shop in the District of Columbia to post on a sign or signs the prices of services rendered to the public and they may specify in such regulations the sizes of the sign or signs, the lettering thereon, and the location thereof upon which prices are required to be posted. The Commissioners are further authorized to prescribe in such regulations that for each violation thereof there may be imposed a fine not exceeding \$200."

"Sec. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second month following enactment."

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia.

Under this legislation the compensation of the Board of Barber Examiners of the District of Columbia would be increased from \$13.07 to \$20 per day.

This legislation would also require that all barber shops in the District of Columbia post prices of every service rendered to the public in a conspicuous place not more than five feet above the floor.

Under existing law any person violating any provisions of this act upon conviction can now be fined not less than \$25. This bill would amend the law by prescribing a maximum fine of \$200, but retaining a minimum fine of \$25. It was felt that the minimum fine should be eliminated and the maximum fine specified and this amendment was written so as to accomplish this proposal.

This legislation has the approval of the Board of Barber Examiners for the District of Columbia and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Because of several errors in the original bill it was felt that a new bill to accomplish the desired aim would be better and the committee for this purpose struck all but the enacting clause from the original bill and inserted new matter.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act

to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved June 7, 1938, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H. R. 8797) to exempt property of the Young Men's Christian Association of the City of Washington—incorporated under the act of Congress of June 28, 1864, Thirteenth Statutes at Large, page 411—from taxation, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question or two of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia who introduced this bill, I believe, by request. I believe that the Young Men's Christian Association has been exempted from taxes for a good many years, perhaps since 1864.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. My understanding is that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have issued an adverse report on this particular legislation dated July 20, 1950. I understand there is now in the building a commercial restaurant. It should not be exempted from taxation. I wonder if the chairman can give us his views on that matter? Is it his intention, if the commercial restaurant does exist in the building of the Young Men's Christian Association, to have that exempt from all taxes?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that the purpose of the bill is to exempt only the building from taxation. They have been exempted for 60 years. However, this year the Tax Assessor has levied a tax on the YMCA Building.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia feels if there is a commercial restaurant there it should be taxed?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. I feel it should be taxed; yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And all of that business will be taxed?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman, and I hope when this bill gets to conference, if the condition does exist, that some amendment will be placed in the bill to correct that matter. The building itself, owned by the Young Men's Christian Association, should not be taxed, but I do feel that if there is a commercial restaurant now in that building operated for profit then that restaurant should pay the same taxes that any other restaurant on that street in the District of Columbia pays.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. I agree with the gentleman and I will work to correct that situation, if it does exist.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 8797 is to exempt the property of the Young Men's Christian Association of the City of Washington from taxation, in the District of Columbia.

The Young Men's Christian Association of the City of Washington was chartered by a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States and approved on June 28, 1864, Thirteenth Statutes at Large, page 411—and the Young Men's Christian Association of the District of Columbia was incorporated on June 6, 1892, under the general corporation laws of the District of Columbia. A statute containing substantially the same language as that now proposed in the bill H. R. 8797 but applicable only to the association known as the Young Men's Christian Association of the District of Columbia has been in force and effect in the District since 1894, act of August 6, 1894, Twenty-eighth Statutes at Large, page 999, sections 47-817, District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition.

For approximately 50 years real estate exemption has been erroneously claimed and granted under the provisions of the statute to the association known as the Young Men's Christian Association of the City of Washington. The proposed bill H. R. 8797 is designed to place the Young Men's Christian Association of the City of Washington in the same position with respect to exemption from real estate taxes as that which is enjoyed by the Young Men's Christian Association of the District of Columbia.

The Young Men's Christian Association is essentially a religious, educational, benevolent, and charitable organization not only in its purpose but also in its operations. The principle of exemption from taxation property used for religious, educational, benevolent, and charitable purposes has been fundamental in American government for many, many years.

The Young Men's Christian Association also operates as a nonprofit corporation. It has no stockholders, nor does it pay any dividends to any individual and all of the earnings of the corporation are used exclusively for the legitimate purposes for which the association was chartered by an act of Congress.

The second paragraph of the bill H. R. 8797 makes this legislation retroactive to August 6, 1894, and would confer legal authority in the District of Columbia for exempting properties of the Young Men's Christian Association of the City of Washington from taxes as they have done under erroneous authority since this date.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all property belonging to the Young Men's Christian Association of the District of Columbia, incorporated June 6, 1892, under the general corporation laws of the District of Columbia, or to the Young Men's Christian Association of

the City of Washington, incorporated by act of Congress, approved June 28, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 411), used and occupied by said associations, shall, so long as the same is so owned and occupied, be exempt from taxation, national and municipal: *Provided*, That where ground of said associations, or either of them, is larger than is reasonably required for them or its use, or is not actually used for the legitimate purposes of said associations, or if said ground or buildings as shall not actually be used for the purposes of said associations or from which they derive a rent or income, such portion of the same, or a sum equal in value to such portion, shall be taxed against such associations.

This amendment shall be effective as of August 6, 1894.

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

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business of the District of Columbia Committee.

CONFERRING CERTAIN JURISDICTION ON THE COURTS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee, I call up House Resolution 747 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 192) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and at this time I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 747 makes in order the bill (S. 192) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties. I believe all of us who have studied the Federal courts realize we should put forth every effort to try to lessen the number of cases that are brought before Federal judges. I am in favor of raising the limit of the amount involved in cases that may come before the Federal courts so as to take them out of the category of being almost what they are, justice of the peace matters.

This particular bill affects only one tribe in New York State. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], told me that some time ago he had the honor of having the title of chief conferred upon

him. Therefore I think it would be well for the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to explain this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have gone over the hearings and who have studied the Federal court situation realize that it is very unfortunate to have these small cases involving disputes among the tribal groups of Indians of New York brought in before the Department of the Interior or before a Federal judge. In my opinion, the enactment of this bill would be beneficial to the Indians themselves and certainly will be beneficial to the judicial processes of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time under the rule on this side.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am in favor of the pending rule; I am also in favor of the legislation it makes in order.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago we considered bills brought in by the District of Columbia Committee. We considered legislation that had to do with barbers, but we passed over a bill that had to do with the regulation of goats in the District of Columbia.

A few days ago the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], in announcing the program for this week was interrupted by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and between the two of the gentlemen they made some levity, I thought, of this matter of regulating goats in the District of Columbia, wondering how many there were of both varieties, the four-legged goats and the two-legged goats.

Well, we had an example today that indicated who the goats are. It costs about \$80,000 a day to run this Congress. That makes \$160,000 a month to run the District of Columbia, and that would mean about \$2,000,000 a year for this Congress to deliberate as we deliberated on these bills that were passed on the regulation of barbers and the regulation of goats within the District. Now, the people who are the goats in general are the 150,000,000 people of the country who are paying the taxes for those deliberations, and the super-duper goats are the 900,000 people who live within the District and who are being ruled by a city council whose concern for the District's welfare is, to say the least, secondary. The regulation of goats may seem trivial to the membership of the House, but it is serious to the people concerned. At this time, when the District is celebrating its sesquicentennial, it seems to me it would be a fitting and proper time to give the

District home rule. We have legislation pending. I think it is a good home-rule bill and meets most of the objections that have been raised against it, and it seems to me that the time is opportune now for Congress to act and give the District the home rule that it deserves.

I call attention to the Members of the House that there are 204 Members who have signed the petition to remove from the committee and make in order the home-rule bill. I am sorry that the bill introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], which he introduced and fathered through one of the legislative bodies 2 years ago, was not the one petitioned for instead of the Kefauver bill. I trust a sufficient number will sign the petition and make the legislation in order, which will give the District at least limited home rule.

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

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I want to compliment the gentleman on a fine statement, and I think it is very apropos. I join with him in his request that we get these additional signatures so that this legislation will be brought to the floor for consideration. It is high time it was consummated.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman, and I know how hard he has worked on home rule, and with some success, in trying to get it through. We on this side have just about scraped the bottom of the barrel in securing signers. We need about 25 more signatures on the petition to bring the bill before the House. I trust that the Republican leadership and the Democratic leadership will remember that both platforms advocated home rule for the District. Let us find out whether we are really sincere or whether we are playing cops and robbers with the District of Columbia that now has almost a million population, who have all the qualifications and the will for self-government.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that my colleague from Utah brought up the subject of goats because, while on the basis of it it looks like the whip notice which was given yesterday we would discuss goats and barbering, and the like, and that that would be a very good reason for home rule. I am one who signed the petition in favor of home rule, but I want to assure you that this subject of goats is a very, very important one. Naturally, it goes clear back to biblical times. It is referred to in the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus, in

the King James version of the Bible, and I would like to quote:

And he [Aaron] shall take the two goats, and present them before the Lord. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat. And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell, and offer him for a sin offering. But the goat, on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat, shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him, and to let him go for a scapegoat into the wilderness. And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness.

Now we know that the administration thought they could make Admiral Hilenkoetter of Central Intelligence the scapegoat for their being asleep at the switch in Korea and to cover up their sins. However, the admiral came up with the records and so they had to look elsewhere for a scapegoat. As usual, they tried to make the Republicans the scapegoats for their sins and errors, and this time it was that the Republicans voted against the Korean aid bill. But they forgot that we had a minority report on file which told the story, and I quote:

MINORITY REPORT

If this is the case (that Soviet troops attached to the North Korean puppet government armies are in positions of command as well as acting as advisers) and there is no reason to doubt the report of the South Korean Government, the Soviet has actually entered the conflict along the frontier. This development may well presage the launching of a full-scale military drive across the thirty-eighth parallel. Unless this Nation is prepared to meet force with comparable force, economic assistance cannot of itself insure the safety or the integrity of South Korea. To the contrary, there is every reason to believe that the lending of economic assistance at this time will only enhance the prize to be taken by force of arms and internal intrigue.

Our forces, with the exception of an advisory mission, have been withdrawn from South Korea at the very instant when logic and common sense both demanded no retreat from the realities of the situation. With our forces on the scene of action, there might have been advanced substantial arguments in favor of economic assistance, but without the presence of an adequate force to protect delivery of, and guarantee practical utilization of, the great volume of material and supplies, it appears folly of the highest order to embark upon the program.

When we get to talking about scapegoats, we know they will have to look for another scapegoat. I will tell you who have been the goats—the people of the country have been the goats. The Democrats have been making them the goat. But here is where they are going to be surprised. They are going to be surprised in November when the goats, as they have called them and have tried to make them, are going to revert to true form and are going to butt the Democrats out of office. Therefore, the bill before us should be amended to regulate the goats throughout the country, rather than those in the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from California has referred to the subject of goats which presumably was to have been a matter of legislative action today. The gentleman from Utah has referred to some levity which occurred here on a preceding day. Possibly I might add to that a little by suggesting that my understanding is in Kansas City the folks who support the Pendergast machine are known as the Goats, and the anti-Pendergast people are known as Rabbits. I do not know whether it was concluded that the legislation pending here today might directly or indirectly have something to do with the chief goat in Washington. About that I do not know for sure, although I rather suspect it does not have much to do with the fact that we did not act upon it today.

Mr. POULSON. I think probably that is the reason why they confined it to the District of Columbia because they were afraid of getting out into Kansas City where the Pendergast machine is running things.

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

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. It is clear now that I was not the one who started the goat business because you had a prepared speech on it.

Mr. POULSON. That is right, because I knew that you have been making goats out of the people for a long time, and that they were going to butt you out of office. I know that your leaders have been using the technique of the scapegoat. I did not intend to bring it up, but since you brought it up, I thought it was a wonderful opportunity to show how the Democrats are operating under the scapegoat philosophy and making the people the goats.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have carefully studied the conference report on H. R. 6000, the social-security bill, and shall support this legislation even though I feel many changes should have been made. I am not in accord with the existing financial arrangement of our social-security program. However, I recognize that this legislation is possibly a compromise and the best that we can get under the circumstances.

I am glad to note this legislation, H. R. 6000, social-security bill, now exempts State and municipal pension plans as well as the school teachers' retirement system from the Federal social-security program. I have always opposed attempts to include existing pension plans in social-security legislation, and I am glad that this bill includes provisions

making these groups exempt from coverage. The provisions of this bill will assure the school teachers of the State of Ohio that their retirement funds remain intact, and teachers cannot, in any way, be denied their rights under their own retirement system.

The same applies to police and firemen and other employees covered under the State and municipal plans.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the gentleman from California, my good friend, Mr. Poulson that as long as he is talking about animals that the only progressive members the Republican Party has had in this generation were men who were known as the sons of the wild jackass.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 192) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 192, with Mr. Young in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will make this preliminary statement brief because I will be followed by the distinguished author of the bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], in whom the House has great confidence. The gentleman from New York is thoroughly familiar with this problem which affects his district. It has the support of both parties on the committee and has already been passed by the other body.

Mr. Chairman, when we get into any Indian problem and try to place them under the jurisdiction of State laws, we always run into certain troublesome problems. The committee has worked hard on this bill, and has tried to protect the rights of the Indians. Even though the committee has held extensive hearings, the gentleman from Oklahoma, chairman of the subcommittee, has drafted certain amendments which he will offer in a further attempt to protect the rights of the Indians. I think he has covered the situation pretty well.

Briefly, the bill does this: It provides that the courts of the State of New York shall have jurisdiction in civil actions and proceedings between Indians, or be-

tween one or more Indians and any other person or persons, to the same extent as the courts of the State shall have jurisdiction in other civil actions.

But you will note how far we have gone in an effort to protect the treaty rights of the Indians. The bill provides as follows:

Provided, That the governing body of any recognized tribe of Indians in the State of New York shall have the right to declare, by appropriate enactment within one year from the date of this act, those tribal laws and customs which they desire to preserve, which, on certification to the Secretary of the Interior by the governing body of such tribe shall be published in the Federal Register and thereafter shall govern in all civil cases involving reservation Indians when the subject matter of such tribal laws and customs is involved or at issue: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to require any such tribe or the members thereof to obtain fish and game licenses from the State of New York for the exercise of any hunting and fishing rights provided for such Indians under any agreement, treaty, or custom: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as subjecting the lands within any Indian reservation in the State of New York to taxation for State or local purposes, nor as subjecting any such lands, or any Federal or State annuity in favor of Indians or Indian tribes, to execution on any judgment rendered in the State courts, except in the enforcement of a judgment in a suit by one tribal member against another in the matter of the use or possession of land: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as authorizing the alienation from any Indian nation, tribe, or band of Indians of any lands within any Indian reservation in the State of New York.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 2 years after the date of its passage.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud of the fact that I have the honor to represent here in the Congress of the United States the Seneca Nation of Indians who are in my district.

The Federal Government has never owned any of the Indian lands in the State of New York. From the very earliest days way back in times when land was granted to the Duke of York by Charles the Second, the State of New York has legislated for the Indians. The Seneca Nation of Indians of New York are fine people; they have been well cared for by the State of New York. I can say without fear of successful contradiction that no State in the Union has appropriated so much money as the State of New York for Indians within the boundaries of the State. I have before me a table which I inserted in the Record when another bill relating to Indians was before the House, but I think you will be interested to know that the State of New York during the period from 1911 to 1950, or during the past 39 years, has spent for Indian welfare a total of \$15,369,213.89, or an annual average of \$415,384.15. The Federal Government has spent during the same period of 39 years for the New York

State Indians a total of \$321,900, or an annual average of \$8,700.

The purpose of the State of New York is to educate these fine Indians to the point where they can enjoy the same privileges in every respect and have the same fine graded schools as the white people. Now we want to go a step further and protect their interests further by saying that they may have the opportunity of going into our State courts on civil matters. The educated Indians, who are the majority in the tribe, of course, are anxious to have this privilege of going into the State courts. Under S. 192 they can go into the county courts, they can go into the supreme court, which would be comparable to the circuit court of appeals in most States, and they could take an appeal to the appellate court at Rochester, N. Y., and from the appellate court to the court of appeals, if dissatisfied. The Indians want this right and the State of New York now wishes to give it to them.

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

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Is it not true that the State of New York is willing to accept the added responsibility of paying for this? It will, therefore, be an economy for the Federal Government if we let them.

Mr. REED of New York. It will be a matter of economy, surely. Some things that occur under the present system are very unfortunate. I have had correspondence with the educated Indians, and they are in favor of this bill. There is, of course, an element among the Indians the same as there is amongst the white people, a few elements who are more or less lawless, and who commit crimes of one kind or another, people who should be subjected not only to criminal action but to civil action as provided for in S. 192. The educated people want recourse to honest courts, and that is what this bill provides. Certain amendments have been proposed to which I shall make no objection. On the whole, S. 192 is a sound bill.

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

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I remember at one hearing before the Committee on Public Lands there was not only a group of Senecas but groups of other Indians who were objecting quite firmly to this bill. They said they had certain treaties made at the time of George Washington, in the early colonial days, in the Revolutionary War period and that they did not want to be brought under the laws of the State of New York because they had certain tribal customs, unwritten laws, and other things peculiar to this Indian tribe which they felt the courts of the State of New York would throw overboard should they come under the laws of the State of New York.

I remember that at that time I said to one of them that they had the fullest protection, that they have the privilege

of society, that they could work in the factories of New York, yet when a member of their tribe commits a crime outside the reservation they want the privilege of running back on the reservation and coming under the tribal customs. The room was full of Indians who objected rather strenuously to coming under this legislation. Perhaps the gentleman from New York, or the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], can throw a little light on this proposition and whether the amendments suggested by the committee will take care of some of their objections.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to say to the gentleman, the distinguished Member of Nebraska, that I have letters that show some of these problems. Here is a letter from an Indian mother who says she is writing to let me know the need for the civil-rights bill to be passed. She writes that last July 22, 1950, there was a peace court held on the Cattaraugus Reservation which ended in bloodshed, that no decision was reached or rendered. Then she goes on to cite the case where the husband of Mrs. ——— was killed and the only child of Mr. ——— was dispossessed and the property given to a third person who was not related at all to Mr. ——— and then Mrs. ——— and her children were left homeless and are now on relief.

Another case was that of a woman who after living 22 years on a piece of property to which she had a life lease was dispossessed. She was hopelessly ill, and, of course, had to be taken care of by the New York State Welfare Organization.

I only mention those things to show the inadequacy of the present system to protect the law-abiding Indians of the State of New York, and we are legislating here for the law-abiding people, the law-abiding Indians. The Seneca Indians are fine people. Take, for instance, the Thomas Indian School. We have appropriated over \$5,000,000 to that one school alone. We have appropriated \$626,615.16 for district schools throughout the reservation.

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

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman that this bill ought to be adopted, but does the gentleman think that in adopting this bill it is going to abrogate treaties that have been entered into and followed down through the years, treaties of the United States which have been in existence all these years? Does it change them? Does it change the unwritten law and the tribal customs, and so forth?

Mr. REED of New York. This is the fundamental proposition. Neither the New York State Legislature nor its courts can change treaties because treaties are the supreme law of the land, naturally.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is claimed that this bill will change those treaties.

Mr. REED of New York. It will not. I did not intend to go into this matter; however, you have a very active lobbyist here who has gone up there and made

speeches and inflamed certain groups of the Indians, telling them a lot of things which are absolutely false.

Let me draw a little picture of what has happened. Here you have a bill on which you had hearings before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate. The bill had full hearings. The Indians were there. Most of the chiefs of the State of New York were there. The committee reported this bill (S. 192) unanimously. The bill then went to the floor of the Senate and was passed unanimously. Theoretically at least, 96 Senators agreed to the bill. Twelve members of a committee in the Senate had agreed to it.

The bill came over here and went to the Public Lands Committee, a committee made up of 28 outstanding, able Members of this House. Hearings were held. When it was all over, some amendments were made to the bill and it was unanimously reported to the House.

Do you know what happened? There were some objections made when the bill was put on the Consent Calendar. That, of course, in a sense thwarted the will of the entire Senate, the Senate committee and the Public Lands Committee of the House. Now we have a rule and the rule comes in here with the unanimous support of the members of the Rules Committee. They examined into the provisions of this bill S. 192. We have our objectors on each side of the aisle, the Democratic objectors and the Republican objectors. They have examined the bill and it was approved by all of them. What I am here for under the rule is to explain a bill that carries out the will of the House and the Senate.

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

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. As one who was born in Salamanca, N. Y., in the gentleman's district, I shall be happy to support this bill. However, that is not the main reason. The real reason I support this bill is because I have extraordinary confidence and faith in the gentleman's approach to his assignments here. I consider him one of the outstanding statesmen of our day.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I cannot plead guilty to his complimentary remarks, although it sounds well.

Mr. Chairman, the rules of procedure relating to bills placed on the Consent Calendar of the House of Representatives ought to be changed to protect meritorious legislation from defeat at the hands of one objector. Even a bill passed over without prejudice on a call of the Consent Calendar requires but one objection when next reached. A bill, however, objected to during consideration of the Consent Calendar, but retaining its place by unanimous consent, requires three objectors when again called.

The rule as it now stands plays directly into the hands of those who may have a selfish interest in killing the legislation. There are unscrupulous lobbyists who are not unmindful of the infinite and remunerative possibilities of this

rule. It is a rule that also often proves very expensive to the taxpayers. Once a lobbyist through his influence has a bill, which he has been retained to defeat, stricken from the calendar, the author of the bill must then obtain a rule from the Rules Committee to bring the bill to the floor of the House for consideration, which takes time and involves great expense to the taxpayer. Furthermore, it retards other legislation. Let me illustrate the point. Here is a Senate bill 192. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a committee composed of 12 distinguished Senators, held a full and fair hearing on the merits of the bill, S. 192.

It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Senate. The bill, S. 192, was considered in the Senate, composed as it is of 96 Members, and passed unanimously. The bill was then messaged to the House and duly referred to the Committee on Public Lands of the House, a committee composed of 28 members of marked ability, which held exhaustive hearings, after which the bill was reported favorably and unanimously. The able chairman of the Public Lands Committee placed the bill on the Consent Calendar of the House to expedite its passage.

When the Consent Calendar was called and the bill reached, one Member arose and objected. The next time the Consent Calendar was called and the bill reached, there were three objectors, which action struck the bill from the Consent Calendar.

Under the rule, it will be observed, three members were empowered to block legislation which already had received the unanimous approval of a Senate committee of 12 Senators, the unanimous approval of 96 Senators in the Senate, and the unanimous approval of the 28 members of the Public Lands Committee of the House. Thus, 3 Members of the House under the rule were able to thwart the bill, the judgment and the wisdom of 124 Members of the Congress.

This is not all. To bring this Senate bill to the floor of the House for final action, the chairman of the Public Lands Committee had to appear before the Rules Committee, composed of 12 Members of the House, and ask for a rule to bring the Senate bill 192 to the floor, which committee unanimously granted the request for a rule for the consideration by the House of the Senate bill 192.

Such dilatory tactics, such obstruction to honest legislation runs into a total expenditure to the taxpayers of many thousands of dollars.

The rule which suffers and permits such dilatory and expensive tactics should be changed to require at least five objectors to strike a bill from the Consent Calendar instead of three under the present rule.

[From the Salamanca (N. Y.) Republican-Press of August 8, 1950]

ONE MAN PREVENTS VOTE ON INDIAN LEGISLATION

The objection of one man, Representative O'SULLIVAN, Nebraska Democrat, yesterday prevented the House of Representatives from voting on the Ives bill to make Indians residing in New York State subject to the civil jurisdiction of the courts of this State.

Had the House been permitted to vote, the bill undoubtedly would have passed, completing congressional action on legislation to remove a serious handicap under which New York Indians now labor.

That such action could be blocked by the objection of one man coming from a far distant State, provides an example of the weird situations that sometimes result from the American system of government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Here is a bill representing the best thought, after prolonged study, of the Indian Bureau of the United States Department of the Interior and of the Legislature of the State of New York. It has been the subject of extended hearings before a committee of the United States Senate, approved by that committee and passed by the full Senate, with the support of both the New York Senators—IVES, Republican, and LEHMAN, Democrat. It follows, as Senator Ives said in presenting it to the Senate, "in logical sequence from the action of the last Congress in making State criminal laws enforceable against Indians"—a change which has worked out to

the satisfaction of the Indians themselves as well as the general public.

"The present uncertainties of existing Indian legal status seriously handicap the Indian in the conduct of his daily affairs," Senator Ives reminded the Senate in explaining the need for such legislation. "A majority of Indians in New York seek employment outside the boundaries of their reservations. In so doing, they are hindered by any employer's all too understandable reluctance to hire anyone against whom he may have no legal recourse. Contracts entered into by Indians are not enforceable in the State courts. Furthermore, tribal customs and laws fail completely to provide a stable foundation on which the fundamental institutions of family and property can be based. Domestic relations show the worst effects of lack of socially desirable standards of conduct. Marriages are terminable by any Indian male at will; no regard is evidenced by tribal custom for the hapless plight of the deserted Indian wife. Problems of inheritance of property, in the absence of any formalized and orderly procedure, often are solved by the traditional 10-day feast distribution. Under this means of disposition, the immediate family of the deceased is frequently left penniless while distant clan brothers receive his property. This bill is a continuation of the process of orderly development of Indian affairs, and it represents a further constructive step in the direction of assumption by the Indian of the full responsibilities of citizenship."

Yet important as this legislation is, and in spite of the fact that it is an essential part of the program of the United States Indian Bureau, the objection of a single individual prevents a vote by the House of Representatives.

Fortunately this is not the whole story, however. The bill was brought up yesterday on what is known as the Consent Calendar—a device for quick enactment of bills to which there is no opposition. To prevent the thwarting of the will of the House by one Member, or a small minority, the rules provide that a bill can be put before the House for a vote through action by the Rules Committee. Representative DANIEL A. REED, of this district will seek such a rule from the committee. In view of the fact that the bill is favored by the Indian Bureau, and therefore is to a certain extent an administration measure, it does not seem probable that the Rules Committee will turn down Mr. REED's request that the House be permitted to vote on the bill.

Expenditures by the State of New York for Indian welfare, fiscal years ending 1911 to 1930

Fiscal years ending June 30—	Indian agents and attorneys	Educational			Social welfare		Highways and bridges		Annual total
		Thomas Indian School	Reservation schools	Agricultural extension work	Medical and nursing	Maintenance of Indian poor	Maintenance and repair	New construction	
1911	\$1,095.90	\$41,022.37	\$12,031.00	—	\$300	\$3,877.83	\$87,750.00	\$68,705.90	\$146,077.10
1912	1,095.90	44,674.42	10,046.29	—	300	2,184.57	59,182.00	—	186,189.08
1913	1,095.90	55,082.86	15,557.13	—	300	1,711.07	76,655.00	—	150,401.95
1914	1,095.90	46,001.47	16,000.00	—	300	6,854.55	40,000.00	134,394.28	244,646.20
1915	1,095.90	47,896.35	25,000.00	—	1,200	5,604.31	40,495.66	53,765.34	178,093.16
1916	1,095.90	45,969.28	17,795.74	—	1,200	5,604.31	40,814.56	72,637.02	185,176.73
1917	1,095.90	66,641.69	18,000.00	—	1,200	8,862.50	51,388.35	—	147,188.44
1918	1,095.90	70,318.45	22,900.00	—	1,200	8,348.39	62,341.36	—	166,227.27
1919	1,095.90	74,879.06	21,945.00	—	1,200	7,823.92	62,164.74	—	189,108.62
1920	1,095.90	107,386.08	23,465.00	—	1,200	6,192.36	62,341.36	—	201,680.70
1921	1,095.90	110,514.63	27,625.00	\$10,000	6,100	8,028.35	63,626.71	140,028.04	367,018.63
1922	1,095.90	103,030.20	28,625.00	6,000	6,100	6,543.21	66,071.26	468,253.77	685,719.34
1923	1,095.90	95,868.44	40,875.00	6,000	6,300	10,733.82	119,483.95	—	280,347.11
1924	1,095.90	106,571.16	41,700.00	6,000	6,300	12,461.35	65,340.49	—	239,468.90
1925	1,095.90	116,059.06	39,500.00	6,000	6,300	15,835.77	104,735.93	—	280,526.66
1926	1,095.90	122,666.30	42,000.00	6,000	6,300	19,210.94	81,337.39	—	278,610.53
1927	1,095.90	137,188.00	49,400.00	6,000	6,300	22,239.86	109,825.03	—	332,048.06
1928	1,095.90	126,863.00	51,400.00	6,000	6,500	27,043.64	71,932.04	322,563.48	613,398.06
1929	1,095.90	130,170.30	58,875.00	6,000	6,500	31,282.70	70,168.97	120,128.50	433,221.37
1930	1,095.90	201,976.00	59,875.00	8,000	6,500	43,000.00	80,000.00	—	399,646.90
Total	21,918.00	1,849,979.72	626,615.16	66,000	71,000	253,398.37	1,444,677.97	1,380,476.33	5,714,665.55

Expenditures for the State of New York for Indian welfare, fiscal years ending 1931 to 1947

Fiscal years ending June 30—	Thomas Indian School	Educational purposes	Attorneys, agents, etc.	Maintenance of Indian poor ¹	Capital improvements, repairs, etc.	Annual total
1931.....	\$195,220.00	\$55,941.47	\$6,042.72	\$72,705.28	\$39,138.94	\$369,048.41
1932.....	172,674.67	65,523.59	35,198.20	94,806.81	8,902.26	377,105.53
1933.....	178,354.94	74,151.88	13,450.75	112,495.93	17,807.18	396,260.68
1934.....	141,246.30	77,720.73	27,724.15	92,951.08	10,549.08	350,191.34
1935.....	151,710.28	78,298.59	21,732.91	100,828.00	2,100.25	354,670.03
1936.....	140,039.99	82,724.65	19,419.25	113,728.00	64,805.34	426,717.23
1937.....	153,807.91	80,068.05	28,956.98	107,909.00	69,514.51	440,256.45
1938.....	170,379.43	80,359.15	15,885.72	91,292.00	65,218.03	429,134.33
1939.....	198,413.59	88,559.23	20,409.37	90,577.00	40,076.01	438,035.20
1940.....	170,320.13	88,321.37	29,160.79	139,962.00	61,804.05	489,568.34
1941.....	169,183.41	98,038.58	23,062.88	112,238.00	25,242.90	427,765.77
1942.....	177,111.00	108,719.47	24,009.90	105,150.00	6,458.06	416,448.52
1943 ²	133,787.60	79,239.67	15,356.67	81,184.00	139.83	309,707.77
1944.....	174,524.68	74,643.59	21,392.00	90,371.00	79.01	361,010.28
1945.....	223,666.63	122,282.51	20,434.57	89,344.00	-----	455,727.71
1946.....	231,186.81	147,372.44	21,087.79	88,314.00	7,449.05	495,410.09
1947.....	259,387.89	171,196.90	20,804.56	111,104.00	18,897.61	581,390.96
1948.....	322,367.11	211,481.05	20,482.10	137,642.00	3,419.50	695,391.77
1949.....	368,697.94	269,222.27	20,262.31	181,694.00	3,635.82	843,512.34
1950.....	369,623.04	349,961.07	19,850.73	235,603.00	22,157.75	997,195.59
Total.....	4,107,703.44	2,404,826.27	424,724.35	2,240,899.10	467,395.18	9,654,548.34

¹ Figures furnished by department of social welfare.

² Covers 9 months only due to change in fiscal year.

³ Received from department of social welfare and includes estimated expenditures for March 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I objected to this bill every time it was sought to be passed. Since my initial objection to it there have been two committee amendments proposed and adopted which removed a great deal of the objections which I have to the proposed legislation. I do not have any apologies to make to anyone for having opposed the measure first, last, and all of the time. I did so because I thought it was very improperly proposed legislation for several very good reasons.

It has been suggested heretofore, and no doubt will be mouthed today that I have been induced to do what I have done for these Indians, because of the solicitation of a lawyer who is a registered lobbyist. That is not true, because whether you know it or not, I have dedicated much of my legal life to the causes of the poor, the helpless, and the oppressed. If, however, a lobbyist had my ear on this matter, then thank God he is working for the unfortunate, oft-mistreated Indians of the Iroquois assembly. If I must be branded as a cat's-paw for a lobbyist, I am so grateful that it is in the cause of the poor, the oppressed, and the helpless, instead of the opposite category. In the practice of law, I was known as the counsel for the indigent, and it seems that I am proceeding in true stride now as a spokesman from a far-away place for helpless Indians. I know that this bill will be passed almost unanimously, but I shall vote against it, nevertheless, because I have always felt that a great poet—Lowell—was right when he said:

He is a slave who dare not be in the right with two or three.

A number of years ago when I was a younger man I was here in Washington to try a case before the then Secretary of Agriculture. With me, at that time, was a very able Omaha lawyer. He insisted that he had to come over to the

House of Representatives to watch the progress of a certain bill, which he explained to me would absolutely take his client out of the criminal category by retroactive legislation which proposed to forgive an alleged criminal act which had been committed at a prior time. We sat right up there in the House of Representatives. While he swore under his breath at the mangy Congressman who was to introduce and put over the legislation, he explained to me that his client had exhausted all of his remedies in the courts and now a law had to be passed to forgive that which had been done.

Since I have become a Member of this House of Representatives I have noticed on many occasions legislation like the tidelands bill, the Kerr natural gas bill, the recent amendment to the Transportation Act, and other instances, where litigants had fought their cases through all of the courts and then when they were finally and decisively beaten, instead of doing that which the honest citizen would do—accept the decision of the court and obey the law—they rush pell-mell to the Congress and finally get from the Congress, if they can, that which the law would not permit them to have originally.

This bill arises out of the same situation, as you will find if you will examine into the matter. In Salamanca, N. Y., you find a city that is built entirely upon an Indian reservation. The city pays rental of about \$11,000 a year to the Seneca Indians. I have been told that seven large factory sites pay a total rental of \$5 a year, and that the average city block in Salamanca, N. Y., pays about 50 cents to \$1 per year rental. This has been going on for a long time. As I understand it, there was originally a 50-year agreement, which I do not question, which provided what rentals should be paid.

Prior to 1942, several of the citizens of Salamanca, N. Y., would not pay the agreed rentals. So the Indians tried to enforce payment of same. They would hire a lawyer, but about the time they got the lawyer hired and briefed, somebody

for some strange reason would suddenly hire him at a salary and pay him more money and he would quit the case. That went on and on until the Indian department submitted finally to the Department of Justice this matter for action.

A very able lawyer by the name of Aubrey Lawrence, connected with the Justice Department, started a lawsuit to make one Forness pay his lease money. Mr. Lawrence won the case for the Indians in the district court of the United States. He won it also in the circuit court of appeals. Certiorari was applied for to the Supreme Court and that was denied and thus the end of the trail had been reached.

This decision rendered by the circuit court of appeals in the case of *United States v. Forness* (125 Fed. 2d 928), decided in 1942, upset the general theory of the New York State lawyers and in substance held clearly that the claims and rights of the Indians were established clearly by treaties, and that a treaty, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has stated, along with the Constitution, is the supreme law of the land.

Then immediately these bills resembling S. 192, began to come into being. Since the year 1943 in about every session of the Congress bills like this S. 192, or similar bills were introduced but not one of them got by the scrutinizing eye of the Congress.

The sponsors of such bills, it appears to me, are great believers in the old blurb, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again."

Everything indicates that we are now on the 1-inch line and greed and injustice is going over the goal quite soon for a touchdown, if the people's great safety man, President Truman, does not stop the ignoble ball carrier with a smacking veto, which I hope he does.

The present bill is wrong in principle because, to use an old Republican "snide expression," it is the camel's head in the tent—it is just a starter to the setting of a bad precedent. This python must go through a series of sliming and swallowing before the carcass can be digested.

To improve the proposed legislation if it does pass Congress, I will offer at the appropriate time an amendment authorizing the law to be submitted to the Indians, under proper procedure for a referendum vote of approval or disapproval of the legislation. The gentleman from New York, Congressman REED, and other supporters of the bill should not oppose this because they say the Indians want it. I just want to learn if these men really know what they are talking about.

Today our boys are fighting for the right of self-determination in Korea. Why not self-determination for the Seneca Indians?

The gentleman from New York, Congressman REED, talks earnestly about what fine people these Seneca Indians are—about how intelligent and progressive they are. Well why is it not good American doctrine at home to let them—these fine, intelligent, progressive people—have a vote on this new departure law and learn whether they want it or

not. Gentlemen, I test your true Americanism with my amendment. I want to know whether you really believe in the right of self-determination at home like you say you do abroad.

I shall ask for a roll-call vote and a record will be made as to the consistency of every one of us. The people will know exactly where we stand on these matters.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, it is fortunate that we have the opportunity sometimes to present to the Members of the House some of the problems that each and every one of us have with our committees. We have not had nearly enough opportunity to present to the Members of this House some of the problems that come before our committee having to deal with the problems of our brothers, people of American Indian descent. I would like to say to the members of this committee that there are no more loyal citizens of the United States than our first born, our American Indians. They believe heartily in the principles of this Government, and I know of no people as a group who will fight harder to defend the principles of this great Government than the brothers we have of American Indian descent.

We held hearings on this particular bill. The hearings were long. We gave every witness an opportunity to be heard. The chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], went into the legislative situation very, very thoroughly, and because of going into the legislative situation very thoroughly he has proposed some amendments which will be offered later in the consideration of this bill. I think those amendments which he will offer will do much to do away with some of the criticism that some people have felt of the bill. I want to say as far as we were concerned, there was almost unanimity of feeling on the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs that we ought to remove restrictions that set aside our Indian brothers in a different category than any of the rest of us. We are going through a long, outdated process of treaties, discrimination, and a maze of obsolete laws. In the time of the early foundation of this country as a safety measure to the residents, it was necessary that some of these Indians be set aside and be treated separately. That time has long since passed. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] spoke to you a moment ago and presented his views. The gentleman is a very thoughtful Member of this House and goes into legislation very thoroughly. But, we do have a provision, I think, in this bill, that will safeguard the landed interests of the Seneca Indians.

For a good many years it was very evident that the State of New York had progressed to the extent that they could very easily take over the civil jurisdiction of these Indians. Long since past we have taken away the Indian Bureau; we have no Indian Bureau office, nor do we want to go back to creating an Indian office in the State of New York. We want to go right ahead. The Indians in

the State of New York are under the criminal laws of the State of New York. The Secretary of the Interior several years ago—the man who is now Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman, who was then Under Secretary—said it was very urgent as a matter of employment and as matter of right and other things in this community that these Indians be placed under the civil laws of the State of New York, for otherwise it would seriously affect the progress we had made. The Indian Office has classified these Indians. They inform us that there is no group of Indians in the United States who are better able to assimilate into the laws of the white man than are those of the State of New York. This is a compliment to the people of the State of New York. There is no segregation there. However, we in the national Congress have to do our part, if we are going to treat these Indian brothers of ours fairly and remove these restrictions and these discriminations, and so on; we are going to have to remove some of these old troublesome laws that are long outdated and set aside these discriminatory practices. That is what we are attempting to do in this bill and that is what your subcommittee on Indian Affairs is attempting to do in the House. We are putting in long hours. We are trying to do something constructive to put these Indians in a position that we no longer say "Indian" but say "American," just the same as we talk about the rest of us as Americans.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall propose in due order and time two amendments to this bill. If these amendments are adopted—and I anticipate that they will be, but of course one never knows, but I believe they will be adopted—it will result, in my judgment, in a good piece of legislation. It will be fair to the people of the great State of New York and fair to the Indians involved. I believe if these two amendments that I shall propose are adopted, that it will practically, if not entirely, dissipate any controversy in the matter.

The first amendment that I shall propose will provide as follows:

That full faith and credit shall be given by such courts to all treaties between the United States and any recognized tribe or tribes of Indians in the State of New York, and in all actions and proceedings with respect to tribal laws and customs between and among reservation Indians full faith and credit shall also be given by such courts to the tribal laws and customs of such tribe or tribes.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the gentleman's opinion, will there be any conflict between the treaty now in existence between the Indians and the State of New York or the Federal Government and the laws under which they necessarily must exist if this bill becomes law?

Mr. MORRIS. Dr. MILLER, no one in the world can answer that with any degree of absoluteness. But I will say in all probability there will be some conflict.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And if there are some conflicts, in the gentleman's opinion do the customs and unwritten laws and those things under the treaty have first priority over the laws of the State of New York, or are they superseded by the laws of the State of New York?

Mr. MORRIS. The treaty rights will have first priority and will supersede the laws of the State of New York, if this amendment is adopted. I call attention to the fact that that same provision in substance is in the bill now as passed by the Senate. This is just a different approach to the same thing which is in the bill. The bill now says:

Provided, That the governing body of any recognized tribe of Indians in the State of New York shall have the right to declare, by appropriate enactment within 1 year from the date of this act, those tribal laws and customs which they desire to preserve, which, on certification to the Secretary of the Interior, by the governing body of such tribe shall be published in the Federal Register and thereafter shall govern in all civil cases involving reservation Indians, when the subject matter of such tribal laws and customs is involved or at issue.

In other words, the bill now says that if the Indians want to exempt any of their laws and customs and treaty rights from the operation of the law, they may do so by declaring what those laws and customs are within 1 year from the time of the enactment of this act. But the objection was made that their tribal customs are such that it might be absolutely impossible to put them in writing. I can see where that might be a good and valid objection. I do not know—they may have some customs that we are not familiar with, which have been handed down from generation to generation, and which are not even capable or susceptible of being expressed in written English language. This amendment, of course, will do the same thing that the original bill coming from the other body seeks to do, but it will do it in a much better and more satisfactory manner, I believe.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If I may say so, I think that the provision in the Senate bill is a very good provision—for this reason—that the difficulty with these tribes in the matter of these customs, which are not written but which are enforced, is that when the individual Indian comes up against the proposition and the tribal court says such and such is the custom, there is no way for him to disprove the fact that it is the custom. Yet it may not be the custom at all, but the tribal court or council is the judge of whether it is the custom or not. So the individual Indian is at a disadvantage. We give the Indian the right to vote and we require him to bear arms, but yet as an individual we deny him the right to go to the courts and to have the

rules and laws under which he is governed written so that everybody can know what they are and so that they will not be changed at the last moment when the case comes up for trial. So far as the gentleman's amendment is concerned, I do not see any difficulty about it, except as to how it is going to be applied, because if the customs are not capable of being written, how is the court going to enforce them? I think they should require to have whatever laws may govern the Indians under the tribal laws written so that the State court can recognize those laws and enforce them. That is our difficulty in New Mexico. And, as the gentleman will remember, we had a similar amendment to the Navajo bill which, I am sorry to say, the President vetoed. But that could not be helped. However, the time will come when that will have to be taken care of. We are denying to the individual Indians their civil rights as State citizens to appeal to the State courts in the settlement of their cases.

Mr. MORRIS. May I say to the gentleman from New Mexico that we have spent a long time in committee trying to work out a satisfactory way to handle this matter. I hope the distinguished gentleman will go along with us on this provision, because I do sincerely believe it is the best solution. This solution is also offered by the Department. This is word for word the final version of the matter which was prepared by the Secretary of the Interior for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We have spent a great deal of time on this particular matter. I hope the gentleman will go along with us on it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I will be more than happy to go along, because, even though it is not perfect, certainly it is a step forward, and I am strongly in favor of that.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman a great deal.

Mr. Chairman, the other amendment which I propose to offer is this:

Provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as conferring jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York or making applicable the laws of the State of New York in civil actions involving Indian lands, or claims with respect thereto, which relate to transactions or events transpiring prior to the effective date of this act.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there will be any objection from any source with regard to this particular amendment. This just assures the Indians of an absolutely fair and impartial determination of any claims they might have had growing out of any relationship they have had with the great State of New York in regard to their lands.

I think there will be no objection to that; they certainly ought to have a right to have those claims properly adjudicated. As it is now, the Indians, as we know, are wards of the Government and, therefore, the statute of limitations does not run against them as it does in the ordinary case. This will preserve their rights so that the statute will not be running against them concerning those claims that might have arisen before the passage of this act.

In addition thereto, of course, they may go into the Federal courts and adjudicate any differences they have had between themselves and the great State of New York relative to their lands, or claims in regard thereto, and I am sure that the State of New York should have and no doubt will have, no objection to such provision.

I expect to offer these two amendments at the proper time. I believe that if these amendments are adopted that we will practically, if not entirely, remove the controversial matters involved in this bill; and I believe that we will then have passed a bill that will be a forward step for the great State of New York and a forward step for these great American citizens up there that we refer to as Indians.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the courts of the State of New York under the laws of such State shall have jurisdiction in civil actions and proceedings between Indians or between one or more Indians and any other person or persons to the same extent as the courts of the State shall have jurisdiction in other civil actions and proceedings, as now or hereafter defined by the laws of such State: *Provided*, That the governing body of any recognized tribe of Indians in the State of New York shall have the right to declare, by appropriate enactment within 1 year from the date of this act, those tribal laws and customs which they desire to preserve, which, on certification to the Secretary of the Interior by the governing body of such tribe shall be published in the Federal Register and thereafter shall govern in all civil cases involving reservation Indians when the subject matter of such tribal laws and customs is involved or at issue: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to require any such tribe or the members thereof to obtain fish and game licenses from the State of New York for the exercise of any hunting and fishing rights provided for such Indians under any agreement, treaty, or custom: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as subjecting the lands within any Indian reservation in the State of New York to taxation for State or local purposes, nor as subjecting any such lands, or any Federal or State annuity in favor of Indians or Indian tribes, to execution on any judgment rendered in the State courts, except in the enforcement of a judgment in a suit by one tribal member against another in the matter of the use or possession of land: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as authorizing the alienation from any Indian nation, tribe, or band of Indians of any lands within any Indian reservation in the State of New York.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect 2 years after the date of its passage.

Mr. PETERSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with; that it be printed in the RECORD and be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRIS: Page 1, line 9, beginning with the word "That"

strike out all language extending through the word "issue" on page 2, line 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That full faith and credit shall be given by such courts to all treaties between the United States and any recognized tribe or tribes of Indians in the State of New York, and in all actions and proceedings with respect to tribal laws and customs between and among reservation Indians full faith and credit shall also be given by such courts to the tribal laws and customs of such tribe or tribes."

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, deferring to the superior judgment of the gentleman from Oklahoma, I made a study of the amendment and we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRIS: Page 3, line 5, before the period, insert a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as conferring jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York or making applicable the laws of the State of New York in civil actions involving Indian lands or claims with respect thereto which relate to transactions or events transpiring prior to the effective date of this act."

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my thoughts with respect to this amendment. Naturally, a good many of the problems which will arise between individual Indians will be with respect to lands, property, and with respect to acts which occurred in the past. I do not know how this amendment is going to be enforced; I should like to hear a little more about just how the gentleman from Oklahoma thinks it can be enforced. I am not, however, going to oppose it, because by adopting this bill it goes to the conference committee and perhaps there the language can be so written as to carry forward what is intended by the amendment. Maybe it will be accepted by the Senate. If it is, then that is all right because we have done the one thing that is necessary, and that is to place them under the jurisdiction of the State laws just as we attempted to do in the case of the Navajo Reservation, where they have no tribal laws, where they have no tribal government for effective enforcement of laws, where they have no tribal courts except those which we have forced upon them. If as time rolls along we discover or the courts discover that most of these past transactions are the ones that are causing trouble they can come back to Congress for an amendment. For these reasons I shall not oppose the amendment but will on the other hand support the amendment in the hope that the bill will pass; and I will support the bill as a good forward step.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Insert as the last paragraph of section 3 the following:

"Provided, however, That this act shall become effective only upon approval of a majority of the New York Indians at an election duly called by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior. Such election shall be held upon 30 days notice at places convenient to the voters and upon such rules as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such election shall be held within 120 days following the passage and approval of this act."

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, at this time, when this legislative body is giving every effort to support the cause of free determination of peoples throughout the world as opposed to the forces of aggression, a very considerable thought must be given to any legislation affecting the American Indian. One need not dwell, except in passing, on the blots besmirching the national honor and sense of fair play which have spattered the record of our dealings and double-dealings with the American Indian; solemn peace treaties broken, agreements violated, lands confiscated, depredations tolerated and duty avoided, all strew the path of our national progress toward assimilation of Indians. Most of the acts were done to the accompanying hymns of "Indian-helping," and with blatant propaganda that same was necessary to help the Indian along the road to progress and to greater freedom.

Today we are rushed into consideration of another piece of legislation stated to be vitally necessary to the New York Indians. The effect of this legislation is to turn all of the Indians in New York over to the State of New York. The effect of S. 192 is to delegate the duty of wardship over the New York Indians, all of them, to the State. Notwithstanding the solemn pledge of the United States to protect the Indians in the free enjoyment of their lands, a clause in the treaties—and notwithstanding the obligation to support their cause through the Federal laws and judicial system, the proposal is now before us to turn over this complete civil jurisdiction, lock, stock, and barrel, to the State of New York, exclusively. Was there ever a more flagrant violation of a treaty, a more craven way of shirking responsibility and breaking faith?

Consider for the moment that some of these Indians live on the same lands which their fathers occupied since the Iroquois Federation was formed in the sixteenth century. Some of them, particularly the Senecas, have been governed by their own constitution for over 100 years. The constitution of the Seneca Indians was recognized by Congress in 1848. This constitution provides for legislative, executive and judicial branches of government independent of other civil jurisdictions. Why must this be destroyed now to give complete authority to New York State? You have heard that it is to be beneficial to the Indians who are enlightened enough to assume equal status with the white citizen of New York. Should not then these same enlightened people be

allowed to express their willingness to accept this new status in surrender of their treaty rights? In all fairness our national ideal must be preserved to allow these people to determine freely their acceptance or rejection of this legislation.

Hence I have offered this amendment to the bill S. 192, which will resolve all doubts about the legality of this legislation.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. Chairman, had it not been for the provision that I discussed only a few minutes ago in the bill itself giving the Indians involved the right to determine whether or not they wanted to come under the law in those instances where their customs, laws and treaty rights should be involved, and now the provision that is in the bill by the adoption of the amendment that I offered that their treaty rights will definitely be observed and protected, and the further amendment that was adopted just a few minutes ago by the committee giving them an absolute guaranty as to a proper and just and equitable adjudication of their claims, had it not been, as I say, for these provisions in the original bill and in the bill as it has now been amended, then the amendment offered by the gentleman would come with great force to me, at least, and I think to all of us. But certainly there would be no point now, as I see it, in going to the expense or using the cumbersome machinery of holding an election there, perhaps causing confusion and misunderstanding. There would be no point to it at all.

We have approached this matter in two different ways in our committee. In one or two instances we have provided for a plebiscite on the part of the Indians, provided for an election to be held, but those were instances where there was just a blanket provision that they be brought under the law. The bill now as it is does not bring them under the law in any instance where their treaty rights could in any way be impaired. It does not bring them under the law or deprive them of any claims that they might have. So, in my judgment, we would be very unwise now in adopting this amendment since the bill is in the condition it is in at this time.

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

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

Mr. McSWEENEY. Did any of the representatives of those Indian groups appear before the committee?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, a number of them.

Mr. McSWEENEY. They are in favor of the bill?

Mr. MORRIS. No. I would say that those who came were not in favor of it. That is why we offered the amendments. They were very much opposed to the bill as it was. I cannot say for absolute certainty, but I do sincerely believe, knowing the matter as I do, having studied it for a long time, that now the Indians will be satisfied. I think almost

all of them will be satisfied because of these amendments that have been adopted. I may say to the gentleman they were very much opposed to the bill originally. Now I believe they will not oppose the bill as it stands at the present time.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON. Their rights will be protected, and, specifically, we are protecting their treaty rights?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. I believe, Mr. Chairman, we would be unwise in adopting this amendment now, but I admit that had we not taken the course we have taken the amendment might have been justified.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. To clear up one point may I say that the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Nebraska is very similar to one which was considered by the committee and rejected. It is almost identically the same words.

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. MARSHALL. We rejected it simply because we believed this provision which we have in the bill itself gives much greater leeway to the Indians at the time as to what they want in their legislation than the provision of accepting or rejecting would. This bill which we have before us gives them plenty of opportunity to pick out those customs which they desire to be recognized by the State of New York.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman for a very fine contribution. I will say this: We feel, after having made a study of the matter, that the amendments we have adopted to the bill will be far better for the Indians and will protect their rights much better than the approach that the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska is trying to make would. In other words, there are so many issues involved, there would be so much confusion that probably they would not know exactly how to vote.

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

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I was going to say that our committee did discuss this amendment and after due consideration they felt it should not be considered on both the minority and majority sides. I am of the opinion that the amendment is not necessary to this bill and it ought to be rejected, and I hope the House will reject it, because the amendment offered by the gentleman who is now in the well of the House, Mr. MORRIS, takes care of the situation that

the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] had in mind.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman. I think that the amendments are far better as affecting both the great State of New York and the Indians involved; in other words, that it is better for all parties concerned; it is a better approach; it is fairer and less confusing, and certainly I believe, or else I would not be here supporting it, that the Indians' rights are definitely and positively protected. I believe that sincerely.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come to be very realistic about this legislation. This is not the first time I have taken the floor in behalf of legislation for the good of the Indians. I have had the honor of representing these Indians in Congress now for 32 years and never once have I had any criticism of any legislation which has been offered here until a certain lobbyist got hold of this bill and has now, of course, found a gold mine as far as the Indians are concerned.

The State of New York has been just and generous to the Indians. They can attend fine Indian schools, financed by New York State taxpayers. I want to give you just another picture of what the people of the State have done. There is not a person here that has been objecting to this legislation, not one from any State, that can show the generosity that has been shown the Indians by the great Empire State of New York. The Indians have been there since the organization of the State under the colonial system. Just take one school alone. From 1911 to 1930, inclusive, the New York State Legislature has appropriated for the Thomas Indian School \$1,849,797.72, and from June 30, 1931, to June 30, 1950, inclusive, the legislature appropriated \$4,107,703.44. Other educational purposes, \$2,404,826.27, and from 1911 to 1930, \$626,615. Agricultural work \$66,000 at one time. Maintenance of Indian poor \$2,249,899.10. Capital improvement repairs from 1931 to 1950, \$469,915. For construction alone \$5,714,665. And so on.

The people of New York like the Indians. They are fine people. They are citizens. As I say, I have represented them for 32 years. The purpose of this amendment that has been offered is to simply water this bill down and ruin this legislation, if they can. There are unconscionable people who visit the Indian reservation trying to get the lawless Indians drunk, trying to terrorize some of them, and see if they cannot defeat this program under S. 192, for the good of the law-abiding Senecas. They have not the interest of the Indians at heart. The reputable, the educated Indians want it. They believe in their property rights. They know that they can get their rights in the State courts. So, I urge you gentlemen not to be carried away by this amendment, the purpose of which is to impose restrictions on sound legislation.

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

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I think the record should show, at this point, the sincere and conscientious fight that the gentleman from New York has put up for the Indians over a period of years. If the gentleman from New York is opposed to this amendment, that is enough for me, because I know that the gentleman only acts in the real interest of the Indians.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman. My forebears were Quakers. The Quakers set up a school way back there in the early 1700's for the Indians. They backed the Indians all throughout the years. Why should I be here trying to do anything injurious to the Indians, whose reservation is right in my district? Why should a person come in here with an amendment and speak for the Indians who lives practically 2,000 miles away from them?

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

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It has been the experience of members of the Committee on Public Lands that most of the difficulty comes about by some lobbyist or cheap lawyer who wants to keep on milking the Indians. That has been done in the past and is being done now. It seems to me if this amendment is adopted it would be a paradise for some lawyers of questionable repute to continue to get fees not always in line with good practice.

Mr. REED of New York. That is what the bill S. 192 is for, to stop this racket being perpetrated by irresponsible people.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I have had the same experience that the gentleman from Nebraska has had. I have had lobbyists call on me that did not know any more about Indians than Japanese. Probably that accounts for the amendment which has been offered.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the fundamental issue at the bottom of this legislation is that stated in a letter read by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], which he received from one of the Indians, and that is whether or not the individual Indian citizens of the State of New York shall have decent courts and shall have the right that every other citizen has to appeal to the courts of the State. I think the Congress has been derelict in requiring these Indians to live under a tribal government all these years without giving them the right that every other citizen has to their State courts. I compliment the committee in bringing this bill to the floor. If we adopt this amendment, we once again sidestep that necessary action. I ask you a very simple question: What right has the majority of the Indians in a tribe to tell the minority citizens of that tribe that they shall continue to be denied their right to appeal to the State courts as State citizens in their reservation? And what right have we to empower a majority of the Indians in a reservation to

say that the minority shall be denied those civil rights as American citizens? That is the issue here.

If we adopt this amendment, we are simply side-stepping the issue again and again as we have done in the past. I think the Congress has been derelict long enough. We ought to proceed with this bill and then bring other bills in affecting other reservations and do the same job for their minority Indians, many of whom have no protection whatever under their tribal governments.

The amendment should be defeated, and the bill passed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the entire 5 minutes, but I do rise in opposition to the amendment because I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] covers the situation. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] would complicate it. However, I know the gentleman from Nebraska is very conscientious and very sincere in this problem, as he is in all other problems. I do not think his approach to this has been engendered by lobbyists or by any other motive, other than trying to benefit the Indians. Indian problems are troublesome. They arouse our sympathies and I believe this is a sincere effort on his part to help them. I do believe, however, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] covers the situation, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] should be voted down.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Indians who appeared before our committee from the tribes of the State of New York were very intelligent and it would be a credit to any State to have such well-informed citizens so well able to express themselves before a committee of the Congress.

I want to emphasize that at no time in any appearance before the committee were there any lobbying activities or any attorneys taking advantage, apparently, of the situation to bring pressure to bear upon the members of the committee. I want to make that point very clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'SULLIVAN) there were—ayes 6, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Young, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 192) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties, pursuant to House Resolution 747, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry

amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'SULLIVAN) there were—ayes 64, noes 1.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Can a Member vote for a bill and then ask for a roll call and object on the ground that a quorum is not present, as the gentleman from Nebraska just did?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is trying to ascertain whether a quorum is present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman voted for the bill. He just rose on a division. And then he voted against it. He voted both ways.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 295, nays 4, not voting 131, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

YEAS—295

Abbitt	Bonner	Dague
Abernethy	Bosone	Davenport
Addonizio	Boykin	Davis, Ga.
Albert	Bramblett	Davis, Tenn.
Allen, Calif.	Brown, Ga.	Davis, Wis.
Allen, Ill.	Bryson	Deane
Allen, La.	Buchanan	DeGraffenried
Andersen	Buckley, Ill.	Dollinger
H. Carl	Buckley, N. Y.	Dolliver
Anderson, Calif.	Burdick	Donohue
Andersen	Burke	Doughton
August H.	Burleson	Douglas
Andrews	Burnside	Eberhart
Angell	Byrne, N. Y.	Elliott
Arends	Byrnes, Wis.	Ellsworth
Aspinall	Camp	Elston
Auchincloss	Canfield	Evins
Bailey	Carnahan	Fenton
Baring	Case, N. J.	Fernandez
Barrett, Pa.	Chelf	Fisher
Bates, Ky.	Chesney	Flood
Bates, Mass.	Chudoff	Fogarty
Battle	Clemente	Forand
Beall	Cole, Kans.	Ford
Beckworth	Colmer	Fugate
Bennett, Fla.	Combs	Fulton
Bennett, Mich.	Cooper	Gamble
Bentzen	Corbett	Gary
Biemiller	Cotton	Gathings
Bishop	Coudert	Gavin
Blatnik	Cox	Gilmer
Boggs, La.	Crook	Golden
Bolling	Crosser	Goodwin
Bolton, Md.	Cunningham	Gordon
Bolton, Ohio	Curtis	Graham

Granahan	Kunkel	Reed, N. Y.
Granger	Lane	Rees
Grant	Larcade	Rhodes
Green	LeCompte	Ribicoff
Gregory	LeFevre	Richards
Gross	Lind	Riehlman
Gull	Linehan	Rivers
Gwinn	Lovie	Robeson
Hagen	Lyle	Rodino
Hale	Lynch	Rogers, Fla.
Hall	McCarthy	Rogers, Mass.
Edwin Arthur	McCormack	Rooney
Hall	McCulloch	Sadiak
Leonard W.	McDonough	St. George
Halleck	McGrath	Sanborn
Hand	McGregor	Sasscer
Hardy	McGuire	Saylor
Harris	McKinnon	Scrivner
Harrison	McMillan, S. C.	Scudder
Hart	McSweeney	Secrest
Harvey	Madden	Shafer
Havener	Mahon	Short
Hays, Ark.	Mansfield	Sikes
Hays, Ohio	Marsalis	Simpson, Ill.
Hedrick	Marshall	Simpson, Pa.
Heffernan	Martin, Iowa	Sims
Heselton	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Va.
Hill	Marrow	Smith, Wis.
Hobbs	Meyer	Staggers
Hoffman, Mich.	Michener	Steed
Holmes	Miller, Calif.	Stigler
Hope	Miller, Md.	Stockman
Horan	Miller, Nebr.	Sullivan
Howell	Mills	Sutton
Huber	Mitchell	Taber
Hull	Monroney	Tackett
Irving	Morris	Taylor
Jackson, Calif.	Morrison	Thompson
Jackson, Wash.	Moulder	Thornberry
Jacobs	Murdock	Tollefson
Javits	Murray, Tenn.	Trimble
Jenison	Nicholson	Underwood
Jennings	Noland	Van Zandt
Jensen	O'Brien, Ill.	Vursell
Jones, Ala.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wagner
Jones, Mo.	O'Hara, Minn.	Walter
Jones, N. C.	O'Konski	Welch
Judd	O'Neill	Welch
Karst	O'Toole	Wheeler
Karsten	Passman	White, Calif.
Kean	Patterson	Whittington
Kearney	Perkins	Widnall
Kearns	Peterson	Wier
Keating	Philbin	Wigglesworth
Kee	Phillips, Calif.	Wilson, Ind.
Kelley, Pa.	Plumley	Wilson, Okla.
Kelly, N. Y.	Poage	Withrow
Keogh	Polk	Wolverton
Kerr	Poulson	Wood
Kilburn	Price	Woodhouse
Kilday	Priest	Woodruff
King	Rabaut	Yates
Kirwan	Rains	Young
Klein	Rankin	Zablocki
Kruse	Reed, Ill.	

NAYS—4

Feighan	O'Sullivan	Tauriello
Gorski		

NOT VOTING—131

Barden	Engle, Calif.	Macy
Barrett, Wyo.	Fallon	Magee
Blackney	Fellows	Marcantonio
Boggs, Del.	Frazier	Mason
Breen	Furcolo	Miles
Brehm	Garmatz	Morgan
Brooks	Gillette	Morton
Brown, Ohio	Gore	Multer
Bulwinkle	Gossett	Murphy
Burton	Harden	Murray, Wis.
Cannon	Hare	Nelson
Carlyle	Hébert	Nixon
Carroll	Heller	Norblad
Case, S. Dak.	Herlong	Norrell
Cavalcante	Herter	Norton
Celler	Hinshaw	O'Hara, Ill.
Chatham	Hoeven	Pace
Chipfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Patman
Christopher	Hollifield	Patten
Clevenger	James	Pfeiffer
Cole, N. Y.	Jenkins	Joseph L.
Cooley	Johnson	Pfeiffer
Crawford	Jonas	William L.
Davis, N. Y.	Keefe	Phillips, Tenn.
Dawson	Kennedy	Pickett
Delaney	Lanham	Potter
Denton	Latham	Powell
D'Ewart	Lichtenwalter	Preston
Dingell	Lodge	Quinn
Dondero	Lucas	Ramsay
Doyle	McConnell	Redden
Durham	McMillen, Ill.	Regan
Eaton	Mack, Ill.	Rich
Engel, Mich.	Mack, Wash.	Roosevelt

Sabath	Stanley	Werdell
Sadowski	Stefan	Whitaker
Scott, Hardie	Talle	White, Idaho
Scott	Teague	Whitten
Hugh D., Jr.	Thomas	Wickersham
Shelley	Towe	Williams
Sheppard	Velde	Willis
Smathers	Vinson	Wilson, Tex.
Smith, Kans.	Vorys	Winstead
Smith, Ohio	Wadsworth	Wolcott
Spence	Walsh	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeiffer with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. James.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Chipfield.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Smathers with Mr. Norblad.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Willis with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Stanley with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Pickett with Mr. Stefan.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Marcantonio with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Carroll with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Lucas with Mr. Werdell.
Mr. Walsh with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Gossett with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Talle.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Breen with Mrs. Harden.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS LEE EDWARDS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6958) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Francis Lee Edwards, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "ninety" and insert "sixty."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "ninety" and insert "sixty."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "ninety" and insert "sixty."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "ninety" and insert "sixty."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDGAR S. BIGMAN

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7017) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Edgar S. Bigman, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "ninety" and insert "sixty."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "ninety" and insert "sixty."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "ninety" and insert "sixty."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "ninety" and insert "sixty."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSING OF LANDS ON CERTAIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4584) to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations in California, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 6, strike out all after "the" down to and including "district" in line 8 and insert "lands upon which the wells are located."

Page 6, line 13, strike out "acquired" and insert "(not to exceed \$5,000) required."

Page 6, strike out all after line 22 over to and including line 14 on page 7 and insert:

"Sec. 8. (a) That any restricted Indian land, whether individually or tribally owned, may be leased by the Indian owners in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 856), and such lands of deceased Indians may be leased for the benefit of their heirs or devisees as provided for by the act of July 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 745)."

Page 7, line 15, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

Page 7, line 16, after "act", insert ", whether made under this section or under any other provision of law."

Page 8, line 4, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Page 8, line 6, strike out "unless so provided in the lease."

Page 8, strike out lines 7 to 11, inclusive.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING NATURALIZATION PRIVILEGES

Mr. WALTER submitted the following conference report and statement on the resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2914)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to remove the racial restrictions on naturalization in the case of certain Japanese persons who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, (60 Stat. 416; 8 U. S. C. Supp. 703), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. The right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States, subject to the provisions of this Act, shall not be denied or abridged because of race: *Provided*, That no alien who, under law existing immediately prior to the enactment of this section as here amended would have been ineligible to immigrate to the United States because of race shall become eligible for immigration to the United States by reason of the adoption of this resolution."

"Sec. 2. Section 305 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1141; 8 U. S. C. 705), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 305. (a) No person shall hereafter be naturalized as a citizen of the United States—

"(1) who advocates or teaches, or who is a member or affiliated with any organization that advocates or teaches, opposition to all organized government; or

"(2) who is a member or affiliated with (i) the Communist Party of the United States; (ii) any other totalitarian party of the United States; (iii) the Communist political association; (iv) the Communist or other totalitarian party of any State of the United States, of any foreign state, or of any political or geographical subdivision of any foreign state; (v) any section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision of any such association or party; or (vi) the direct predecessors or successors of any such association or party, regardless of what name such group or organization may have used, may now bear, or may hereafter adopt;

"(3) who, while not within any of the other provisions of this section, advocates the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the economic or governmental doctrines of any other form of totalitarianism, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism, or the economic and governmental doctrines of any other form of totalitarianism, either through its own utterances or through any written or printed publications issued or published by or with the

permission or consent of or under authority of such organization or paid for by the funds of such organization; or

"(4) who advocates or teaches or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization that advocates or teaches (i) the overthrow by force or violence or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (ii) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government because of his or their official character; or (iii) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (iv) sabotage;

"(5) who writes or publishes or causes to be written or published, or who knowingly circulates, distributes, prints or displays, or knowingly causes to be circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or who knowingly has in his possession for the purpose of circulation, publication, or display, any written or printed matter, advocating or teaching opposition to all organized government, or advocating (i) the overthrow by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (ii) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government; or (iii) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (iv) sabotage; or (v) the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the economic and governmental doctrines of any other form of totalitarianism;

"(6) who is a member of or affiliated with any organization that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, or displays, or causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, or display, any written or printed matter of the character described in subparagraph (5).

"(b) The provisions of this section or of any other section of this Act shall not be construed as declaring that any of the organizations referred to in this section or in any other section of this Act do not advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means.

"(c) The provisions of this section shall be applicable to any applicant for naturalization who at any time within a period of ten years immediately preceding the filing of the petition for naturalization is, or has been, found to be within any of the classes enumerated within this section, notwithstanding that at the time petition is filed he may not be included within such classes.

"(d) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the giving, loaning, or promising of money or anything of value to be used for the advocacy or teaching of any doctrine above enumerated shall constitute the advocacy or teaching of such doctrine; and

"(2) the giving, loaning, or promising of money or anything of value to any organization, association, society, or group of the character above described shall constitute affiliation therewith; but nothing in this paragraph shall be taken as an exclusive definition of advocacy, teaching or affiliation.

"(e) The Attorney General shall publish in the Federal Register, at least once in every calendar year, a list containing the name of every organization which, after appropriate investigation and on the basis of evidence or information satisfactory to him, he deems to be Communist, Fascist, totalitarian, subversive to the national security, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Con-

stitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means. He shall from time to time, by publication in the Federal Register, add to or delete from such list such organizations as he deems to be of such character, or to be no longer of such character, as the case may be.

"(f) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to any person who shall be a member of any organization described therein at the time such organization is designated as Communist, totalitarian, Fascist, subversive to the national security, as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means, and who shall, within three months from the time of the promulgation of such designation in the Federal Register, pursuant to subsection (e) of this section, renounce, withdraw from, and utterly abandon such membership, and who thereafter ceases entirely to be affiliated with such organization. The provisions of sections 2 of the Act of October 16, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 1012; 8 U. S. C. 137 (g)), shall not apply to any such person who shall so renounce, withdraw from, and utterly abandon such membership, and who thereafter ceases entirely to be affiliated with such organization: *Provided*, such person establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that he did not know or have reason to believe at the time he became a member of such an organization (and did not thereafter and prior to the publication of the name of such organization as provided in subsection (e) of this section acquire such knowledge or belief) that such organization was Communist, totalitarian, Fascist, subversive to the national security, had adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or sought to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

"(g) If a person who shall have been naturalized after the enactment of this section, as here amended, shall, within five years next following such naturalization become a member of or affiliated with any organization, membership in or affiliation with which at the time of naturalization would have precluded such person from naturalization under the provisions of subsection (a), it shall be considered prima facie evidence that such person was not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and was not well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States at the time of naturalization, and, in the absence of countervailing evidence, it shall be sufficient in the proper proceeding to authorize the revocation and setting aside of the order admitting such person to citizenship and the cancellation of the certificate of naturalization as provided in Section 338 of this Act."

"In lieu of the amended title proposed by the Senate amendment, amend the title so as to read: 'To amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
ED GOSSETT,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
W. E. JENNER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendment of the

Senate in the nature of a substitute to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence [joint resolution to remove the racial restrictions on naturalization in the case of certain Japanese persons who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924], submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on:

The resolution as it passed the House of Representatives provided that the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race. This resolution also provided that no alien who, under law existing immediately prior to enactment of the resolution, would have been ineligible to immigrate to the United States because of race shall become eligible for immigration to the United States by reason of the adoption of the resolution.

The net effect of the resolution as passed by the House of Representatives would be to remove all racial barriers to naturalization of those persons who are legally in the United States at the time of enactment of the resolution.

The resolution as amended by the Senate extended the provisions of existing section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, to include Japanese persons and persons of Japanese descent who (1) entered the United States (including the Territory of Hawaii) prior to July 1, 1924; (2) have resided continuously in the United States (including the Territory of Hawaii) since such entry; and (3) are not subject to deportation.

The net effect of the resolution as passed by the Senate would be to extend the privilege of naturalization only to those Japanese persons and persons of Japanese descent who have resided in the United States, including the Territory of Hawaii, since July 1, 1924, and who are not subject to deportation, but several Asian racial groups such as the Burmese, Indonesians, Koreans, Maoris, Polynesians, Samoans, and Siamese would, under the Senate amendment, still remain on the list of races barred from United States citizenship.

The resolution as agreed to by the conferees provides that the House version of the resolution be adopted with an amendment, namely, insertion of the phrase "subject to the provisions of this Act." This additional language insures that all aliens eligible to petition for naturalization under the provisions of section 303 as amended by House Joint Resolution 238 will be subject to all of the other provisions of the Nationality Act. The insertion of this additional language meets the objections raised when the resolution was before the Senate that the resolution might permit a great many other aliens to be naturalized who were not otherwise eligible under all of the provisions of the nationality laws.

In terms of figures, the resolution as agreed to by the conferees, would make eligible for naturalization about 48,000 persons of the Japanese race residing in the continental United States and about 38,000 such persons residing in the Territory of Hawaii. In addition, the resolution would make eligible for naturalization approximately 700 Koreans residing in the continental United States and about 2,300 Koreans residing in Hawaii, plus less than 150 persons of the other, above-mentioned, Asian races of which about 20 percent reside in the Territory of Hawaii and the rest in the continental United States.

The following table illustrates the numerical extent of the effect of this resolution: *Aliens eligible to citizenship under H. J. Res. 238: Continental United States and Hawaii, 1940*

Alien people	Residing in—		Total	Percentage in United States
	United States	Hawaii		
Japanese.....	47,305	37,353	84,658	55.99
Korean.....	749	2,390	3,139	20.7
Other Asian.....	104	41	145	71.7
Total.....	48,158	39,784	87,942	54.8

Source: Sixteenth United States Census.

In recommending the adoption of the resolution substantially as passed by the House of Representatives, the conferees have fully realized that the highly desirable extension of eligibility to naturalization calls for additional safeguards and that, therefore, section 305 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, should be amended. Accordingly, the conferees recommend the addition of a new section to House Joint Resolution 238, which in amending section 305 prohibits naturalization of any alien who at any time within a period of 10 years immediately preceding the filing of the petition for naturalization is, or has been found to be within any of the general classes enumerated therein.

The amendments proposed to section 305 are substantially as follows:

"(1) Naturalization is specifically prohibited to anyone who within 10 years preceding the naturalization has belonged to the Communist Party of the United States; any other totalitarian party of the United States; the Communist political association; the Communist or other totalitarian party of any State of the United States, of any foreign state, or of any political or geographical subdivision of any foreign state; any section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision of any such association or party; or the direct predecessors or successors of any such association or party, regardless of what name such group or organization may have used, may now bear, or may hereafter adopt.

"(2) The Attorney General is required to publish in the Federal Register at least once in every calendar year a list containing the name of every organization which, after appropriate investigation and on the basis of evidence or information satisfactory to him, he deems to be Communist, Fascist, totalitarian, subversive to the national security, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of Government of the United States by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means.

"(3) An alien who belongs to any such organization on the date of its proscription shall have 3 months from such date to withdraw from the organization.

"(4) A person who is naturalized after enactment of section 305 as thus amended and who within 5 years after such naturalization becomes a member of or affiliated with any organization which would have precluded his naturalization under subsection (a) of section 305, as amended, shall be presumed to have obtained naturalization by fraud or by illegal procurement."

In view of the fact that sections 303 and 305 both relate to eligibility to naturalization and liberalization of section 303 necessitates the strengthening of 305, the conferees unanimously agreed that the conference report hereby submitted represents a

germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
ED GOSSETT,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have been working for 7½ years for this day—the removal of racial discrimination from our naturalization laws. Someone has said that House Joint Resolution 238, the conference report on which we have just adopted, is 25 percent of the Judd bill, H. R. 199, which removed racial discrimination from both our naturalization and our immigration laws. Actually, House Joint Resolution 238 means more than that because the passage of this portion of my bill should make easier the passage of the remainder.

H. R. 199 is the Eighty-first Congress version of legislation I vowed when I came to Congress I would try to get enacted, as a matter both of plain justice and of great benefit to our own country's standing and influence in the Asiatic half of the world. It was passed by the House on March 1, 1949. It went over to the other body and hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. However, inasmuch as that committee was engaged in a comprehensive revision of our immigration laws, it incorporated the features of my bill in its omnibus bill which was reported out on April 20, 1950, as S. 3455. Because of the legislative jam in the other body, it appears that this bill will not be given consideration during this session of the Congress.

So the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] took the first section of my bill, H. R. 199

and introduced it as House Joint Resolution 238. It passed the House by unanimous consent, but was considerably modified in the other body. Now the conferees have agreed upon a bill which is substantially that passed by the House, with the addition of provisions to prevent persons who have been members or supporters in the last 10 years of organizations declared by the Attorney General to be subversive in character, from taking advantage of the naturalization privileges provided in the Resolution. Also any person naturalized under this Resolution who becomes a member or supporter of any such subversive organization within the next 5 years may have his naturalization revoked.

Under the joint resolution as just adopted, almost 85,000 Japanese who were admitted to this country for permanent residence prior to the passage of the Exclusion Act on July 1, 1924, can now apply for citizenship papers the same as alien immigrants from any other land. Also 3,139 Koreans will be made eligible and 145 other Asians—mostly Burmese, Indonesians, Samoans, Polynesians, and Siamese.

These persons have all lived in the United States for more than 25 years. They have entered into our society, they pay taxes, they are law-abiding and self-supporting—but they cannot obtain the coveted privilege of becoming naturalized as full-fledged American citizens.

Their sons, native born American citizens, volunteered by the thousands in World War II and fought with unsurpassed bravery, skill, and patriotic devotion. It has been a travesty on justice that their fathers and mothers who brought them up to be such exemplary American citizens have heretofore been ineligible for naturalization solely because of their race. I know the passage of this joint resolution will make glad their hearts and those of their children.

Mr. Speaker, I still hope that before the Congress adjourns there may be some way to get the other half of this job done—the removal of racial discrimination from our immigration laws also. As long as this needless insult, for example, to Koreans, remains on our statute books, we are sending our soldiers into that land to fight with one hand tied behind their backs, or at least without the full moral armament they deserve and which it is our business to provide them. No other act gives so much damaging propaganda material to our Communist enemies, as the remnants of the old exclusion laws. Let us be done with them once and for all by making the immigration quotas for the remaining 12 excluded areas available to persons born in those areas of races indigenous to them. At the very most, only 1,285 more persons of Asian races could be admitted per year. For us it costs almost nothing; to them it is the difference between being treated as less than human beings and as being recognized and officially treated as equal human beings. It is unworthy of our country, and dangerous to our sons, not to do now this act of long-delayed justice.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to note the approval with which

the House has received this resolution. Personally, I would have preferred to see the provisions of the Judd bill, establishing a quota for the Japanese people, enacted into law, and in this respect, this resolution does not go far enough.

However, it does in measure right the wrong created by the Oriental Exclusion Act of 1924 in predicated our immigration policy toward the peoples of the Far East solely upon the basis of race. This resolution declares that "the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States, subject to the provisions of this act, shall not be denied or abridged because of race." This is as it should be, for there is no such thing as a master race.

This resolution will at long last give the right to the Issei, the foreign-born Japanese, who came to this country seeking permanent residence prior to 1924, to apply for United States citizenship. It will do away with property restrictions against them; it will give them the opportunity to rise from residence by sufferance to equality of rights under our laws. It is good that they should be permitted to become citizens of our Nation after all these years.

Mr. Speaker, I have had no opportunity to examine carefully the conditions and restrictions outlined in the resolution upon which these people may become citizens. I hope and trust they are not unduly onerous, else another great wrong will have been done.

SETTLEMENT OF CONFLICTS INVOLVING ENEMY PROPERTY

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 748, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 516) authorizing the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, to conclude and give effect to agreements for the settlement of intercultural conflicts involving enemy property. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 748 makes in order House Joint Resolution 516, authorizing the President or such other officer to

work out if feasible the intercustodial conflicts involved under present procedure.

I believe if there is one thing America can be proud of it is the fact that even to our enemies we have tried to do justice, even to the enemy aliens we have tried to do justice. This bill which has been introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], in fact, tries to make some arrangement whereby we can make equitable distributions of these properties which have been in conflict for such a long time. This is rather an intricate bill; and so I, as a member of the Committee on Rules, do not have an opportunity to study such things in an intimate way, am going to ask the members of the legislative committee to present it to you and to give you the different parts that have been in question, and undoubtedly the questions that arose before the Committee on Rules will be answered by the members of the legislative committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article by Bill Cunningham from Sunday's Boston Herald.)

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to iron out certain intercustodial problems that arise naturally in our worldwide obligations. It merely authorizes the President to carry out certain agreements with nations that were our friends during World War II. It carries no authorization or appropriation.

I understand the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs are unanimously for it, as were the members of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the primary duty of government as we all know is to bring justice to its people, and that has been the first duty and function of our Government since its institution under constitutional form.

In accomplishing that first duty as a legislator in my 22 years of service in this body I felt that I could do so to the maximum extent possible on the domestic front by supporting vigorously and voting for legislation that would not only preserve but strengthen the family life of America. As we all know, the family life of a nation determines the strength or the weakness of a nation, not only my family life but the family life of every person. A strong family life means a strong nation; a weak fam-

ily life means a weak nation. We all know as experienced legislators and men and women who have taken the journey of life to the point we have now reached and from our studies and experiences a very important factor in determining whether the family life of a nation is strong or weak played by the moral and economic outlook of a family and of the over-all families of the nation; and we also know that wherever there is a broad middle class that a nation is strong, that where the families of a nation are economically satisfied, are in safe economic condition, not too many of the families of the nation economically weak, so to speak, that a strong nation exists. As long as the family life of a nation is strong the nation will continue strong because the basic factor of society and of a nation is the family, that little group constituting the family, the father, the mother, and the children with all of the joys and sorrows that make up the family life and make up the lot of the individual on his journey through life. The individual is a component part of the very basis of society itself, the family. That is why I voted for rural electrification, if you please, because it aided and strengthened the family life in our rural areas; for soil conservation, the family life of our farmers; for flood control, for public power where private power could not or would not develop; for the minimum wage; for all legislation of that kind which directly affects the family life and which preserves and strengthens our family life.

Fifteen years ago today one of the greatest bills of modern times in connection with preserving and strengthening the family life of America was signed by the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I refer to the social-security law. I was a member of the original subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means that drafted that bill. I was a member of the full committee that reported the bill out. I remember well the historic fight in this body to obtain the passage of the bill.

I remember the determined effort that was made to strike out the insurance feature of the bill, known as the earned annuity provisions.

Mr. Speaker, 15 years have gone by since then. This progressive, magnificent piece of legislation has shown that its effect that the family life of America has been strengthened under legislation recommended to the Congress by the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt and passed by the Congress under his leadership and through Members of Congress like myself and others who believed in it, who believed in preserving and strengthening the family life of America. Fifteen years have gone by and countless millions of Americans and their families have benefited by the passage of this progressive bill.

Today is the fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Social Security Act by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Let us see some of the things that have flowed from that bill and evaluate them in terms of the family life of America. In 1934, before the passage of the bill, there were about 280,000 dependent children being assisted in one form or an-

other. These were a very small number receiving benefits under State laws, the benefits also being small in amount. Now, under Federal-State programs, financed jointly by the Federal and State Governments, there are 1,600,000 dependent children being assisted and the average payment is \$47 per month. The total payments to dependent children from 1935 to June 1950 were \$2,753,000,000.

Evaluate that in terms of families and dependent children economically distressed belonging to families economically distressed. What better example of the exercise within our way of life of the power of government to bring justice to a deserving element of our people and to strengthen the family life of America, thereby strengthening Government itself.

On August 14, 1935, when the social-security law was signed by the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt, the great humanitarian, only 27 States had laws providing for cash payments to the blind. Any one of us is likely to become blind during our journey through life but, as I stated, only 27 States at that time had laws giving assistance to the blind. There were between 32,000 and 34,000 persons without sight then receiving an average monthly assistance of \$20. There are now 77,000 such blind persons receiving assistance under the joint Federal-State program and the average monthly payment is \$47. Under this year's amendment an additional 18,000 blind persons will receive benefits, representing those who are now being helped by some States and one Territory without Federal aid. Since 1935 the total payments to the blind under the Social Security Act have been \$287,000,000.

According to the best records, in 1934, 235,000 needy persons were receiving assistance from 28 States and 2 Territories, averaging \$14 per month per person. There are now 2,900,000 needy aged persons receiving old-age noncontributory assistance under the Federal-State program with an average payment of \$44 per month. From August 14, 1935, to June 1950, the total amount received by such persons is \$9,985,000,000.

Evaluate that in terms of the American family during that period and what it has meant in preserving and strengthening the family life of those persons and in keeping hope existing in their minds and faith and confidence in our institutions of Government.

Under the earned annuity system, the insurance plan, in reference to which a determined effort was made to strike it in 1935, there are covered about 35,000,000 employees. An additional eight to ten million will be included when the present conference report pending in this body is agreed to. Two million one hundred thousand retired worker and 750,000 mothers and children during the past 15 years have received \$3,375,556,469. The average monthly payment to them is now \$26; but the pending bill about to be adopted will increase payments as high as 77 percent. The number of covered persons will increase as the years go by and the number receiving earned annuity payments will increase also as the years go by.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when the Social Security Act went into effect, only one State, Wisconsin, paid unemployment compensation insurance. Now all States, as well as Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia have such laws by reason of the passage of the Social Security Act, recommended by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, and passed by a Democratic Congress. From August 14, 1935 to June 1950, workers in America who have been displaced in employment from time to time, have received in unemployment compensation the sum of \$7,949,549,413. Evaluate that in terms of families, in preserving and strengthening the family life of America. The law authorized grants to States also for a broadened policy of child health and welfare care. The total amount of the act in connection with these programs is \$189,367,598. Such grants to States for a broadened program of child health and welfare care were authorized by the Congress first in 1921, but shortly afterwards were allowed to lapse. But again, Franklin D. Roosevelt fought for that class; those unfortunate human beings. He revived this system in the Social Security Act which became law in 1935.

The first theory of the Social Security Act was that of a private insurance company. The individual worker, so far as annuities were concerned, was covered and payments were made to him. In 1939 we amended and broadened it using the family as the basis of consideration. I was on the committee that drafted the amendments in 1939 to the 1935 act. We then made the family, the home life, the basis of beneficiary payments, providing payments to the widow, providing payments to the minor children, which were denied in the first act of 1935. But within a period of 4 years we realized that the social considerations and importance of this far-reaching act justified us in changing from the individual as the conduit of consideration so far as benefits are concerned, to the family, thereby strengthening the family life of America. That was the concept in 1939, and it is the concept now.

In a few days there will be 8 to 10 million more employees in America covered by the earned annuities. Fifteen years ago the cry of socialism was hurled at this legislation. The insurance companies said it would destroy the insurance business of America, yet 15 years later the insurance companies have underwritten three times as much insurance covering individuals as they had up to that time. It has strengthened competitive enterprise. In the insurance field it has made the American people insurance-minded, and instead of destroying insurance companies, they have three times the coverage now that they had 15 years ago.

Today is the fifteenth anniversary of the enactment of this law. Fifteen years ago a man who was then living signed it, the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He is now dead. But this is only one of the many imprints that he has left upon the pages of history that will make him stand for all time and for countless generations as one of the great men who have lived in any generation and among any people of the world.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and I ask unanimous consent that she be permitted to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 15 years of social security; 5 years since VJ-day.

It so happens that I celebrated VJ-day in Moscow. We had been in Paris, my colleagues Tom Gordon, Joe Ryder, Karl Mundt, and I, waiting for the permission of the Soviet to fly our own American plane into Moscow. They kept us waiting 2 weeks, but we waited for we did not propose to go in by Russian plane. We proposed to take the Stars and Stripes into Moscow.

Taking off from Berlin with a Russian navigator we flew very low over the intervening country. Landing at the Moscow airport, we were met by the Intourist group. They delegated an English-speaking young man of 23 to us. We knew that of course he was not only interpreter and guide, but that he would report to the NKVD. We were taken to a small hotel, the larger one being forbidden foreigners. There we were very glad that previously it had housed another official group for whom it had been thoroughly cleaned up. We were made very comfortable—though the water was never hot when we were in our rooms, which the manager always regretted volubly. We were taken here and there: to a farm, a show farm, of course; to workmen's housing units which they showed us with great pride—though we could compare them only to our old-fashioned tenements. I remember one kitchen very well that had a little bit of a trickle of water that was supposed to be hot, with many families living in, oh, such close quarters.

Moscow itself was a most depressing place. People swarming everywhere—and, oh, so poor. We saw very few shoes. Most of the people we saw on the streets had burlap wrapped around their feet and legs up to the knees, and they never seemed to smile.

Of course there were costumes of every kind, for they came from all over the U. S. S. R.: from Outer Mongolia, from the Far East, from beyond the Urals, they came from the south and from the north. Those with whom we were permitted to speak were very eager to speak to us and they were consumed with curiosity over me—a woman from America.

Each morning the Embassy gave us as many copies as we could carry of the little magazine America, which was censored here before it was even printed, and of which there were allowed only 10,000 copies when we were there. But soon after our return we were permitted to send in 50,000 copies. We gave one of

those magazines with perhaps a cigarette for tips. Immediately from nowhere there would come swarms of people, gathering around to see the magazine. And how careful they were not to tear it. They wanted to see the pictures of America. I gave one to our chambermaid. I can assure you that no bell was answered that afternoon.

We flew up to Leningrad, that beautiful Venice of the North. There the people were of quite a different type. The women had more oval faces and were altogether more attractive. And people laughed and talked on the street corners. Not so in Moscow under the shadow of the great block of buildings housing the NKVD whose windows were alight at all hours.

In Leningrad we saw a large electric plant. We would not consider it a good factory or a tidy factory. It was not ordered as our factories are nor was the lighting passable according to our standards. There were German prisoners working, with whom I talked. I speak German and, to the anxiety of the manager and young "Serge," rather faster than they could readily understand. They were afraid I might be indiscreet. But when I told them what I had been saying, they were relieved, and the little man clicked his heels and saluted, and said, "Madam, your hand."

You see, one of the Germans was a boy who had been born in Newark. He and his family went to Germany in 1936 and there he joined the army. I suggested that perhaps he had earned his place as a working prisoner of war and suggested that perhaps it was just as well that he should help to rebuild some of the things he had helped to destroy. This pleased the Russians.

And the little manager clicked his heels.

On the night of the celebration of VJ-day we went into the Red Square with members of our Embassy staff. It was absolutely filled with a curiously quiet mass of humanity. You could not have gotten a flaxseed more into the place. Yet, in spite of that, children would weave their way through our legs, almost throwing us down had we not been held up by the very crowd itself. We stood by an automobile, which gave us a certain protection.

The Red Square is a most impressive place. It is very large. As you go into it from the end opposite an old church building with its onion-shaped towers, you have on the right the great red wall, red granite, with the serrated top we associate with the little German castles we had as toys when we were young. Do you remember them? Against that red wall are planted the most beautiful blue spruce that you can possibly imagine with Lenin's tomb in front of them, also in red with black marble pillars at the top and always a light burning, surrounded by smaller blue spruce. It is from that tomb that Stalin and the hierarchy review the parades of which we have seen photographs.

There was a curious quiet. They were not enthusiastic as they had been on VE-day when they shouted aloud and tossed members of our Embassy staff in

blankets for half hours at a time. No—they seemed to have little interest—to know little about what they were there for. And why should they—for the U. S. S. R. made but a gesture in the token war against Japan.

Then came the fireworks—as magnificent a display as I have seen anywhere. And finally the salute of 48 guns. Yes, it was very impressive there on the Red Square in Moscow. But when I go back over these 5 years and what Moscow was given for her gesture, when I consider the betrayal of China—yes, of Asia—when I think that we gave them Mukden where the heavy tanks are made that are being hurled against our men in Korea my heart is heavy, even as it was 5 years ago on that great square so filled with people who never smiled, celebrating victory in a war they knew little of and shared for such short days.

This, gentlemen, is something that we need to think about—5 years after VJ-day.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 516) authorizing the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, to conclude and give effect to agreements for the settlement of intercustodial conflicts involving enemy property.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 516, with Mr. BUCHANAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 516 would authorize the President, or such officer or agency as he may select, to conclude and give effect to agreements to further amicable and expeditious settlement of intercustodial conflicts involving enemy property.

This resolution as originally drafted was introduced by myself as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs early during this session of Congress. It was considered by the full committee. The committee then directed a clean bill to be introduced. That was done by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. The chairman then appointed a subcommittee to further consider the measure. The subcommittee was composed of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVRS]. This subcommittee, after conducting

hearings, perfected and reported out the measure before the House today. It had the unanimous approval of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, this bill arises out of the seizure of German enemy assets during the war. Many conflicts of jurisdiction arose as to which Alien Property Custodian was entitled to consider particular German assets. Some assets seized were claimed to be owned by nonenemy interests. Similar conflicts in World War I resulted in lengthy and burdensome lawsuits; as a matter of fact some of these matters were not settled until 1940, a matter of 22 years after the end of the last war. I think I can best illustrate what this bill tries to do by citing you various examples of the different disputes and conflicts that may arise out of these conflicts between different nations.

Let us say that a certificate of shares of stock of the United States Steel Corporation are located in the Netherlands but belong to a German in Germany. Here you have a possible conflict between the Netherlands Alien Property Custodian, who claims he has the physical certificate in his hands and that therefore the Netherlands should get those 10 shares of stock. Let us say the United States Alien Property Custodian says that the certificate of stock really represents an asset in the United States of America and, therefore, the asset belongs to the United States Alien Property Custodian. Under the Brussels agreement, which is the main agreement from which we work, it is resolved that the stock certificate would go to the United States Alien Property Custodian.

The second category of claims arises out of the following situation: A United States corporation is owned 60 percent by Germans and 40 percent by Americans. This corporation owns a factory in the Netherlands. The factory is seized. It is contended by the Netherlands Government that since 60 percent of this American corporation is owned by the Germans that, therefore, the Netherlands should be entitled to receive the asset that is represented by the factory. The United States Government, on the other hand, contends that we do have 40 percent interest held beneficially by citizens of the United States and certainly we could not let that claim of the citizens of the United States go. Under the Brussels agreement the conflict would be resolved as follows: The delivery of those assets in the Netherlands would be made to the United States Government because it is a United States corporation, but the United States would reimburse the Netherlands Government to the extent of 60 percent of the value of that asset which is located in the Netherlands, because 60 percent of that asset is controlled by Germans.

The third large category of claims arises out of this type of situation: You have a German corporation organized and existing in Germany. Sixty percent of the German corporation, however, is controlled by Americans and 40 percent

of the corporation is controlled by Germans. The Netherlands contends that since this is a German corporation all of these assets should go over to the Netherlands. However, again we have a situation where 60 percent of the interest is owned by American citizens and consequently under the Brussels agreement it is stated that 60 percent of the beneficial interest in the German corporation's asset located in the Netherlands would be paid over to the United States Custodian.

This House can easily see that unless we have cooperation between the various governments involved, we are going to have conflict after conflict and lawsuit after lawsuit in order to determine which national is entitled to a share of these assets held in all the nations of the world. In view of the conflicts, the United States Government has entered into negotiation with various countries throughout the world who were our allies in order to resolve the conflict. An example is the Brussels agreement of 1947 which was signed by the United States, Canada, the Netherlands, Denmark, Luxembourg, and Belgium.

The resolution before this committee today is intended to give the President of the United States or his designee the authority to negotiate and carry out international settlement of these various property disputes. Failure on our part to give this authority will only result in excessive suits and prevent the liquidation of alien property in the United States and realization of the net proceeds of these funds into the war claims funds.

This legislation will further make available substantial dollars assets to Marshall plan countries who sorely need these dollars in order to bolster up their economy. Also, Americans and other nonenemies who may have interests in the property involved are seriously delayed in obtaining free use of their assets.

This legislation will further ease the burdens on the Government in administering these properties.

I should like to analyze the bill for you section by section.

Section 1 limits the authority to countries not at war with the United States during World War II. The problems arising out of Italy and Japan will be subject to peace treaties with those nations.

Section 2 of this bill provides that the agreements must be made in accordance with the policy of the United States to eliminate German assets and enemy interests in these properties and see to it that these interests go to the countries involved.

Section 3 involves a knotty problem. One of the problems in all these bills was to define the meaning of the words "enemy national." Article 21 of the Brussels agreement fixes a cut-off date of September 1, 1939; therefore, there are excluded those refugees who were required to leave Germany and Austria subsequent to September 1, 1939.

These people were never enemies of the United States, they were never sympathizers of Germany, but they were

required because of either religious or political beliefs to leave these nations. This paragraph does not make it mandatory, but directs the President of the United States in future negotiations to use every possible effort to accord these people equal treatment to that accorded United States nationals.

Our committee was very careful to put in a saving clause as a condition precedent which would require these individuals to be United States citizens prior to the effective date of any of these agreements in order for them to be protected by such agreement.

Section 4 of this bill provides that reimbursement payments are to be administered as vested property. This is very important. Under the War Claims Act of 1948 the net proceeds of vested German and Japanese property are covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the war claims fund for the payment of awards made by the War Claims Commission on the personal injury claims of American nationals who were internees and prisoners of war of enemy nations. The treatment of reimbursement payments under intercultural conflicts as vested property will insure that the net proceeds of these payments will be available for war claims purposes. In the same manner it is estimated that because of the passage of this bill there would be made available to be covered into this fund approximately \$30,000,000. This fund will be readily and quickly available to the prisoners of war and to the internees who have waited so long to be compensated for their injuries and the damages they have received.

The last comment I have to make about the bill is that no appropriation is required and none is authorized.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Can the gentleman tell me if the \$30,000,000 which he mentioned for the War Claims Commission is going to be sufficient to satisfy these claims? I note in the report it is stated that the views of the War Claims Commission were requested to be furnished to some committee in writing on July 25, 1950. I have since heard from some members of the War Claims Commission that they are a little disturbed and are afraid that their rights under this bill are not safeguarded sufficiently and that the amount set therefor will not be sufficient.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I may say to the gentleman from New York that one of the fears of the War Claims Commission is embodied in a proposed amendment by them which will be submitted by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] as a committee amendment at the request of the War Claims Commission. This will satisfy any question of conflict as to whether these funds will be actually covered into the War Claims Fund. The \$30,000,000 is not sufficient, but keep in mind that the \$30,000,000 they will receive is money that they otherwise would not receive.

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, this is money that they otherwise would not have received. As a result of these negotiations the forfeiture of the residue of the enemy property has only one place to go and that is in the War Claims Fund. The sooner this bill is passed and the agreements are ratified and entered into, then the sooner the property will be liquidated and the proceeds will go into the War Claims Fund. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will offer the amendment to satisfy the War Claims Commission.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for the interest she has shown in this particular matter and to assure her that the committee looks at this particular situation in the same light. May I call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that the amendment which will be offered with committee approval, and it has the approval of the War Claims Commission, reads as follows:

Provided, That nothing contained in this act shall hinder, restrict, or limit the payment of claims from the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948.

That takes care of everything.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I just wanted to be sure these claims would be amply provided for.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They will be.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, there are no requests for time on this side. I suppose that is because the subcommittee has done such a good job in preparing this bill and the comprehensive report. It is always interesting to note that if a subcommittee works hard and brings a bill before us in good shape, then it goes through without much trouble or attention, whereas if the subcommittee or committee has not done its work so thoroughly, we have a big fight and lots of publicity. I am not suggesting of course that this is the only reason we have fights; many bills from our committee deal with problems so difficult that they are bound to be controversial.

I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on the majority side, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] on the minority side for having handled this complicated, technical subject so well that after some revisions it won the unanimous approval of the full Committee on Foreign Affairs and I am sure will be unanimously approved here, too.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, is au-

thorized to conclude and give effect to agreements to further the amicable and expeditious settlement of intercultural conflicts involving enemy property, subject to the following:

(1) The authority herein granted shall extend only to agreements with governments with which the United States was not at war in World War II.

(2) Such agreements shall be in accordance with the policy of protecting and making available for utilization the American and nonenemy interests in such property and further the elimination of enemy interests in such property and the efficient administration and liquidation of enemy property in the United States.

(3) For the purposes of this resolution, the United States as to any intergovernmental agreements hereafter negotiated shall seek treatment equal to that accorded United States nationals for persons who, although citizens or residents of an enemy country before or during World War II, were deprived of full rights of citizenship or substantially deprived of liberty by laws, decrees, or regulations of such enemy country discriminating against racial, religious, or political groups: *Provided*, That on the effective date of this resolution such persons were (1) permanent residents of the United States and (2) had declared their intention to become citizens of the United States in conformity with the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; and that such persons shall have acquired citizenship of the United States prior to the effective date of any intergovernmental agreement hereafter negotiated.

(4) Reimbursement to the United States by other governments pursuant to such agreements shall be administered as vested property.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD: Strike out the period at the end of paragraph 4 and substitute therefor a colon and add thereto the following: "*Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall hinder, restrict, or limit the payment of claims from the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948."

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is acceptable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUCHANAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. J. Res. 516) authorizing the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, to conclude and give effect to agreements for the settlement of intercultural conflicts involving enemy property, pursuant to House Resolution 748, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUNGRY HORSE HARRY KELLY, OF MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in a eulogy of Hungry Horse Harry Kelly, of the State of Montana; and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include various newspaper articles and editorials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep regret and personal loss that I report to the House the passing of my good friend, Harry Kelly, of Kallispell, Mont.

Harry Kelly, better known as Hungry Horse Kelly, contributed tremendously to the building up of the State of Montana. He was specially concerned with the Hungry Horse Dam project now under construction in northwestern Montana. He was the father of this project and he worked unceasingly for it from the 1920's on down. His was indeed a voice in the wilderness, but his perseverance and foresight carried the day.

We, of Montana, are indeed fortunate that we have Hungry Horse today because it is the first step in the development of our State. The people of the United States also owe a debt to Harry Kelly for the part Hungry Horse will play in our national defense set-up.

There is so much one could say about Harry Kelly and the many fine things he has done throughout his entire lifetime, but words fail me on this sad occasion. To Mrs. Kelly, who was such an outstanding helpmate throughout their life together, and to Bill, Harry, Helen, and Margaret Kelly I want to extend the condolences and sympathy of my family and the people of the State of Montana.

We will all miss Harry Kelly, but his monument, the Hungry Horse Dam, will forever attest to his wisdom and will serve as a perpetual marker over the valley he loved and the State he worked so hard, so long, and so faithfully for.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting with my remarks news stories and editorials from the Hungry Horse News of August 11, 1949, and the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, the Montana Standard, of Butte, Mont., the Butte Daily Post, and the Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., all under date of August 8, 1950:

[From the Hungry Horse (Mont.) News of August 11, 1950]

A RIGHTFUL TRIBUTE

The 34-mile long lake that will be created by Hungry Horse Dam has not been named.

It's time that the Flathead should give serious thought to what name it wants on its maps, for likely within a year the con-

crete plug will start holding water back. There's good reason to recommend that it be called Kelly Lake.

Wednesday, Harry J. (Hungry Horse) Kelly was buried. The 80-year-old Kallispell newspaperman 25 years ago championed Hungry Horse Dam at a time that the rest of the valley viewed it as fantastic. He never wavered in supporting the project. An old-time editor, who published his first newspaper in Missoula in 1888, he got the name of Hungry Horse Kelly. He was proud of it.

The Flathead liked the old man, who remained keen and capable until he died. Even before the first blast officially marked the start of dam construction, Hungry Horse Kelly commented that light metal industries would now come to the Flathead. It wasn't a passing thought.

Local groups have already expressed their sentiments that an important feature of the Hungry Horse project carry the name Kelly. He was pleased by the idea.

The Flathead should take action to name the Hungry Horse Reservoir, Kelly Lake.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of August 9, 1950]

"FATHER" OF HUNGRY HORSE DIES

KALISPELL, August 8.—Harry J. Kelly, 80, pioneer Montana newspaperman, died at his home here yesterday.

Kelly, the first to champion the idea of Hungry Horse Dam, gained the nickname, "Hungry Horse Harry," and the title, "Father of Hungry Horse Dam." He first began his crusade of editorials and speeches in 1933 and continued it until 1944, when Congress approved the Bureau of Reclamation plans. He received the pen with which President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the bill.

He was born at Prairie du Chien, Wis., October 6, 1869. He attended public schools and Creighton University at Omaha, Nebr. He acquired his early experience in the newspaper business in the offices of the Bee and the Republican-Herald there.

He engaged in newspaper work at Leadville, Colo., southern California, and Seattle, before coming to Montana in 1889. He lived first at Missoula where he was employed by the Missoulian. He worked on the Butte Miner in 1899 and helped publish the first issue of the Anaconda Standard.

On August 2, 1899, he married Mary See, a native of Montana, and they had two daughters, Helen and Margaret, and two sons, William G. and Harry J., Jr.

He returned to Missoula in 1902 and later was associated with the Spokane Review for about 2 years. In 1905 he moved to Hamilton where he bought an interest in the Bitterroot Times, which he published for about 3 years.

He served as sergeant at arms during the sixth session of the Montana Legislature. Returning to Butte, he was with the Butte Miner, and later went to Lewistown where, with Tom Stout, he organized the Democrat News. He sold his interest to Stout when he was appointed registrar of the United States land office in July 1913. He was reappointed in 1917.

He owned and published the Flathead Monitor, Kallispell weekly newspaper, from 1924 until March 1944, when he sold the plant to Cecil Kavanagh, Shelby. He was named president of the Montana State Press Association in 1937. He was a member of the Elks lodge.

[From the Montana Standard, Butte, Mont., of August 8, 1950]

KALISPELL PUBLISHER WHO FATHERED DAM PROJECT DIES

KALISPELL, August 8.—Harry J. Kelly, the father of Hungry Horse Dam, is dead.

The retired newspaper publisher died Monday at the age of 80.

Kelly became known as "Hungry Horse" Kelly because he was one of the first to advocate the dam being built in the Flathead River South Fork, near Columbia Falls. He began promoting the project through his newspapers in the 1920's.

Kelly came to Montana in 1888. In a half-century he worked on Montana daily papers and owned weekly publications in Fergus County, the Bitterroot Valley and in Kallispell. He ran the Flathead Monitor here until his retirement 6 years ago.

Survivors include the widow; a son, William, who owns radio station KXLO at Lewistown; another son, and two daughters.

[From the Butte (Mont.) Daily Post of August 8, 1950]

PIONEER MONTANA NEWSMAN DIES

KALISPELL, August 8.—Harry J. Kelly, 80, pioneer Montana newspaperman, died at his home here Monday.

Kelly was born at Prairie du Chien, Wis., and attended public schools and Creighton University at Omaha, Nebr. He came to Montana in 1888 and worked at Missoula, Butte, and Anaconda.

In 1898 he married Miss Mary See, a native of the Bitterroot Valley. In 1905, he operated the Bitterroot Times during the capital fight between Helena and Anaconda.

Later that year he went to Lewistown and with Tom Stout started the Fergus County Democrat which was later consolidated with the Lewistown-Democrat News. In 1934, he came to Kallispell and bought the Flathead Monitor which he operated until 1944.

He was a former president of the Montana Press Association. He and Mrs. Kelly observed their fiftieth wedding anniversary 2 years ago.

Kelly was an advocate and booster of the Hungry Horse Dam project to the extent that he was given the nickname "Hungry Horse Dam Kelly."

[From the Missoulian, Missoula, Mont., of August 8, 1950]

HARRY J. KELLY, HUNGRY HORSE BOOSTER, DIES

KALISPELL.—Harry J. Kelly, 80, for 56 years a Montana newspaperman before his retirement in 1944, died at his home, 541 Third Avenue East, Monday afternoon. He had been in failing health for several months.

His last newspaper work was on his Flathead Monitor, which he sold 6 years ago. In its columns for years he boosted the Hungry Horse project until he earned the name "Hungry Horse Kelly." He started boosting the project in 1926.

Mr. Kelly was born at Prairie du Chien, Wis., October 6, 1869, and with his parents moved to Omaha when a small child. He attended public schools at Omaha and later was a student at Creighton University. He learned the printing trade in Omaha and on coming west arrived in Missoula in the fall of 1888.

Later he went to Butte where he worked on the Butte Miner, and later on the Anaconda Standard when it started. He returned to Missoula and in 1905 operated the Bitter Root Times during the Montana capital fight. He was also in the publishing business at Hamilton at one time.

In 1898 he married Mary See, a native of the Bitterroot Valley.

They moved to Lewistown in 1905 where Mr. Kelly and Tom Stout (now editor of the Billings Gazette) started the Fergus County Democrat. They later consolidated the enterprise with the Daily News as the Lewistown Democrat-News.

In 1912 Mr. Kelly was appointed registrar of the United States land office at Lewistown, a position he held until after World War I. In 1924 the Kellys came to Kallispell where he purchased the Flathead Monitor plant. Mr. Kelly had been about his home as usual

and during the past week with Mrs. Kelly had celebrated their fifty-second wedding anniversary. Two years ago they celebrated their golden anniversary when their four children were home. All recently have been here on summer trips.

Surviving are the widow, Mary; two daughters, Mrs. Peterson, San Francisco, and Margaret Kelly, Kalispell; William G. Kelly, Lewistown, and Hal J. Kelly of the University of Washington faculty in Seattle. The son, William, former Kalispell postmaster, resigned some months ago.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1838) to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of United States marshals, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the amendment of the House and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOBBS, McCULLOCH, and RODINO.

REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3921) for the temporary appointment of referees in bankruptcy, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the amendment of the House, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOBBS, REED of Illinois, and WILSON of Texas.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

BIGGER PENSIONS BUILD UP HOME DEFENSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we heard a great deal this afternoon about the history of the social security law from our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. I am certain that he, in his remarks, has covered this 15-year period of the working of this legislation down to the present. However, I should like to say just a few words with reference to the bill that is now pending which seeks to amend the present social security law.

H. R. 6000 is an easy number to remember.

Millions of people in the United States are watching it hopefully.

It will bring bigger social-security pensions, and to more old folks, soon, if the Congress approves the bill known as H. R. 6000 without any mongrel amendments.

The controversial Knowland rider to this bill, dealing with certain provisions of State unemployment compensation laws, has no place in a measure dealing with old-age security. It is a nuisance attachment, calculated to get a free ride for itself. It must be divorced from old-age security and considered separately on its own merits or demerits.

We want a clean bill to boost old-age pensions and extend coverage without any delaying tactics.

H. R. 6000, stripped of the Knowland amendment, will accomplish this purpose. It will mark the first significant fleshing out of old-age pension legislation since the original skeleton bill was passed in the 1930's.

It will help us to catch up with the improvements that should have been made during the intervening years by those who ganged up to defeat progress.

Getting down to fundamentals, we find that the strength of our Nation is based on the morale of its cumulative home life.

Too many Americans have worked hard all their lives only to find, through no fault of their own, that they have no retirement security when they are no longer employable. Too many widows have been faced with the double burden of providing personal care for their young children and trying to be breadwinners for them at the same time.

The dread of such insecurity, and the fearful experience with it, gnaw at the faith and confidence of our people. We have many public and private agencies who work hard trying to cope with this problem after the damage has been done.

Even a nation with the abundance we possess cannot survive if millions are not allowed to share, to some extent, in that wealth which is the creation of all.

Insofar as the aged of either sex, and the widowed mothers of minor children, and so forth, are concerned, entitlement to such participation is gradually being recognized as a matter of right rather than charity.

I say that home defense against economic insecurity is imperative from the viewpoint of each individual and the Nation as a whole.

Furthermore, in this world of tightening tension, where the free way of life is in competition with the regimented system of communism, we must demonstrate in every way that ours is better. To prevent hundreds of millions of Asiatics and others from making the wrong choice, it is necessary to show that we are providing economic security for our own people.

The protection of our Nation in the world at large depends upon military strength, economic assistance, and diplomatic know-how.

These are basic, but they alone will not do the job.

There is need for a strong Voice of America to tell the world how the people of the United States live, and to offer encouragement to the poverty-stricken masses of this globe. We believe that if they follow the free way, they will better their standard of living.

The Voice of America will not succeed, if Communist propaganda can rebut our claims by revealing the insecurity from which too many Americans suffer.

Plainly, then, we must work with diligence to improve conditions at home, so that we can offer proof positive to the world that the greatest possible opportunity and security can only be found in a free society where men are finding the answers to modern problems without

surrendering their identity as human beings.

Social security, broad in scope, and realistic in its benefit payments, is an effective answer to the Communist charge that we ignore the want that exists in a land of plenty.

H. R. 6000 is a great step forward toward genuine security in the United States.

New groups coming under the retirement program for the first time, will include more than 10,000,000 workers. This will bring the total up to 45,000,000.

Benefit payments, or the amount of individual pension checks, will be hiked up by an average of 77½ percent.

Those coming under protection at long last, will be—

Four million five hundred thousand self-employed, with the exception of professional workers, such as doctors, lawyers, and so forth.

Nine hundred thousand farm laborers who make their living by this occupation, who have worked at least three continuous months for one employer.

One million domestic servants employed 24 days and paid \$50 by one employer in any calendar quarter.

Casual laborers who are on the same basis as domestic servants.

State and local government employees who do not have their own retirement systems.

Federal civilian employees not covered by the Federal retirement plan.

Employees of certain publicly owned transit systems.

Outside salesmen.

Americans employed abroad by American concerns.

Optional coverage for employees of certain nonprofit organizations.

This new coverage, as enumerated above, will go into effect in January 1951. The new benefit scale will become effective earlier.

World War II veterans will get wage credits of \$160 for each month of service, financed from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

The present 1½-percent tax on both employees and employers will remain at that level until 1954. It will then be gradually increased until 1970 when the rate for each will reach 3¼ percent.

Under a new-start provision, more people will be able to qualify for benefits. A 62-year-old worker who was covered for any six quarters becomes fully eligible now upon reaching the age of 65. Previously the requirement was that he must have been employed for half the total working quarters from 1936 to retirement.

The Knowland amendment is in regard to Federal contributions to the administration of State unemployment insurance laws. It would stop the Secretary of Labor from declaring a State law out of conformity with Federal standards prior to final adjudication of the issue in the State courts. It also stipulates that he must give 90 days' notice to a State before withholding the funds after it has been decided by the courts that the State is not conforming to the Federal requirements.

This is a direct attack on the unemployment compensation system itself. It should be stricken from this bill.

President Truman has requested that the Knowland amendment be deleted from the social-security expansion bill.

I join with many others in his stand.

Bigger pensions for more people should not be jeopardized by this amendment, which restricts the unemployment compensation system. It is a subtle form of blackmail which says in effect, "You have got to go along with me and cut down on unemployment compensation or you will not get increased coverage and benefits for the aged."

To this we answer: "The social-security expansion bill will pass, and without any road blocks to bar its way."

I believe that H. R. 6000 should be re-committed to the committee on conference so that the Knowland amendment will be pruned from the bill. Then we can strengthen social security without any further opposition or delay.

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

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I think it should be made clear in the RECORD that the Knowland amendment that the gentleman refers to is the amendment of Senator KNOWLAND, of California, and not the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NOLAND].

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. BLATNIK. I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts on his very vital remarks. I want to point out that this insecurity is like a gnawing cancer, which hangs like a sword by the thread over the homes and families of so many working men and women in America. The Senator Knowland amendment which was injected into the social-security bill is just another one of the many pruning steps—I call it systematic pruning of the benefits of the rights of working men and women.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his contribution. I know he is well versed on this subject because he has devoted a great deal of study to the social-security laws.

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

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. JACOBS. With regard to the Knowland amendment as I understand it, it is not the amendment which removes the benefits from those who are totally and permanently disabled. Am I correct in that? That is not the Knowland amendment, is it?

Mr. LANE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JACOBS. May I ask the gentleman one additional question, if he has any opinion on the subject, if the bill should be recommitted, what does the gentleman think of the chance that the bill will be enacted in this session of the Congress, if any?

Mr. LANE. I am hopeful, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana, that if it is recommitted, the committee of conference will be wise enough to strike out

the Knowland amendment and come back to us so that we can pass it this year. I do not feel a motion to recommit will delay the bill in any way. I am hopeful that we will be able to pass it this session.

Mr. JACOBS. What about the provision with reference to permanently totally disabled? I think that is more important than the Knowland amendment.

Mr. LANE. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana. I, too, favor the permanent and total disability provision of the bill which of course has been stricken from the bill by the Senate.

LABOR'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] for his timely remarks in support of the social security bill (H. R. 6000) and for pointing out that the intent of the Knowland amendment is to undermine the Federal-State unemployment compensation program. This amendment, which was approved by the Senate without committee hearings, is designed to prevent enforcement of minimum unemployment compensation standards, and to allow State governments to withhold unemployment compensation to workers who refuse to accept scab jobs.

The unemployment compensation program is most important to our working population, and this effort to wreck the program reflects the antilabor attitudes of many Members of Congress. Its approval is one more indication that the Eighty-first Congress has not kept faith with the men and women of labor.

I would like to remind the House that labor is one of the most important economic groups in our society. Sixty million workers and their families comprise the largest single segment of our population. Their toil produces the goods that make our Nation strong in peace and war. Labor's work in our mines, factories, and forests and on our railroads, ships, and farms has made America the richest country on earth. For its contributions to the national well-being, American labor deserves the gratitude and respect of every citizen.

You will recall that in 1948 the workers helped to elect President Truman and a Fair Deal Congress pledged to a program of full employment, economic security, and social justice. Labor votes gave the Congress a clear mandate to write this program into law.

The Eighty-first Congress is about to adjourn, and I regret to say that many pledges to labor have not been honored. Letters from workers in my district indicate that they are dissatisfied with the legislative record of this Congress—they are asking why so little labor-endorsed legislation has been enacted and why NAM-sponsored legislation adopted by the Eightieth Congress has not been repealed. This is a moot question, and I, too, wonder why.

For labor's program is not a minority program. The legislative platforms adopted by the various labor organizations reflect the best interests of the American people. I wish to say a few words on some of the programs that have labor's backing.

CONTROL INFLATION

Workers everywhere are alarmed over the inflation that has developed since the outbreak of the Korean war, and they have good reason to be. Prices have increased 10 percent in the last 6 weeks, and are still going up. Unless action is taken without further delay, this inflationary spiral will jeopardize our entire economy, and destroy the wage levels and living standards of our people.

I join with labor in urging legislation to curb speculation and profiteering, roll-back prices and tax excess profits. Such action is necessary to prevent further deterioration of the economic situation. At the same time, I oppose the Republican proposal to let prices go up first and then freeze both wages and prices. This is nothing more than a GOP scheme to shift the entire burden of defense upon the backs of the workers. I refuse to discuss wage controls until the wage-price balance has been restored through a price roll-back to June 1 levels.

REPEAL TAFT-HARTLEY

Labor wants the vicious Taft-Hartley law repealed. AFL President William Green stated recently that Taft-Hartley repeal and the reinstatement of the Wagner Act is essential to national security, and I wholly agree with his sentiments. The Taft-Hartley law is contrary to American ideals and the spirit of our Constitution. It was sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers and passed by the Eightieth Congress to cripple and eventually destroy worker organizations. Its effect has been to prevent true collective bargaining. The Taft-Hartley law weighs the scales in favor of management by encouraging the use of court injunctions and the Army as standard strike-breaking devices.

Industrial peace and uninterrupted production cannot be obtained by applying Taft-Hartley shackles or by any other type of repressive antilabor legislation. Friendly labor-management relations require action to eliminate conditions that cause labor unrest. Good wages, reasonable hours, and decent working conditions, obtained through the channels of free collective bargaining, guarantee peace and production. In the interest of justice and of good labor relations, the Taft-Hartley law must be wiped from the statute books and the Wagner Act restored in full.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

Every worker desires good wages to enable him and his family to live a healthy, happy life, and to educate his children. One of the best ways to guarantee good wages and to wipe out sweatshop conditions in industry is passage of a liberal minimum-wage law.

Last year Congress did pass an amended Fair Labor Standards Act—Public Law 393—which raised the minimum wage to 75 cents per hour. This new law is pretty phony, and labor must

not permit it to stand without improvement. It reduced wage-hour coverage from 22,600,000 to 22,000,000 persons. Most of those removed were workers who stood to gain raises under the new 75-cent minimum hourly rate. Now, 95 percent of all workers covered by the act already make more than 75 cents an hour. The other 5 percent were averaging 65 cents. Thus, the net effect of the new law was an average increase of 10 cents an hour for about 750,000 workers. Last year's mighty congressional effort on wage-hour legislation produced one very small mouse.

The wage-hour law requires immediate revision. I maintain the 75-cent minimum should be immediately raised to \$1 per hour and coverage extended to every worker. Also, the law's enforcement powers must be strengthened. A floor of a dollar an hour under wages would mean higher living standards, the end of sweatshop competition in business, and increased purchasing power in the hands of the consumers of the products of farm and factory. Our entire society would benefit.

SOCIAL WELFARE AND ECONOMIC SECURITY

All labor organizations are agreed on the need for a broad program of social welfare and economic security for our entire population. Among the several labor-endorsed proposals which have my complete endorsement, are the following:

First. Expansion and liberalization of the Social Security Act to provide adequate old-age pensions to every retired and permanently disabled worker;

Second. Amendment of unemployment compensation laws to provide a minimum of \$30 per week for 26 weeks for every worker who becomes unemployed;

Third. Adoption of a Federal health program to provide more doctors, dentists, hospitals, and other facilities, and an insurance system to pay for adequate medical treatment for all citizens;

Fourth. Expansion of public housing construction and the adoption of a co-operative housing law, to provide adequate low-cost housing for all Americans; and a strong rent-control law to keep rental housing within the reach of the average worker's pocketbook; and

Fifth. Adoption of Federal aid-to-education legislation to improve educational standards, raise teachers' salaries, and equalize educational opportunity, plus authorization of additional funds for school building to relieve overcrowding.

These five welfare proposals are sound and deserve the support of every citizen. Their adoption by Congress is necessary to protect Americans from the economic consequences of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment, and to guarantee decent housing, good jobs, and better education. These goals were first set forth in the late President Roosevelt's Economic Bill of Rights. I regret to say that, with the exception of the Wagner-Ellender housing law and the social security amendments (H. R. 6000), Congress has done very little in the past few years to write this welfare program into law.

LEGISLATION FOR ALL PEOPLE

Labor has an excellent record in the support of legislation beneficial to the entire Nation. Labor supports the Brannan farm plan for agriculture, civil-rights legislation, veterans legislation, inflation control, and a more equitable tax policy based on relief for low-income groups and increased levies upon corporations and individuals best able to pay. This is not a narrow program—it is one which should be supported and enacted in the interest of the vast majority of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, labor has no desire to secure special treatment at the expense of the Nation. Labor has no interests separate and apart from those of the public. The workers are the people. When they urge Congress to meet social and economic needs of the American people, they are only voicing hopes and aspirations of men and women everywhere. Demands of the people for economic security and social justice must be satisfied. Otherwise democracy will either wither and die, and government by and for vested corporate interests will become the American way of life.

As a labor-backed Representative, I have urged acceptance of a broad program of jobs, welfare, and security for our people. Steadfastly I have opposed selfish interests who seek to pervert the ends of democratic government. I have fought for the rights of labor in the Halls of Congress. Always I have opposed those who seek to "lynch labor" with their Taft-Hartley laws. This I will continue to do as long as I remain in Congress.

All that serves labor, serves the Nation. All that harms labor is treason to America. No line can be drawn between the two. If any man tells you he loves America, yet hates labor, he is a liar. If any man tells you he trusts America, yet fears labor, he is a fool. There is no America without labor, and to fleece the one is to rob the other.

Those words are Abraham Lincoln's. They express my sentiments, my sympathies, and my faith in the working people of America, who make this Nation strong and great.

STRIKE AT INGERSOLL-RAND WORKS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, at the Ingersoll-Rand works at Phillipsburg, N. J., a strike is now on, headed by one Marcel Scherer, who for over 20 years has been one of the Communist Party's shrewdest special-assignment trouble-shooters. Marcel Scherer is Moscow-trained. Marcel Scherer has run the magazine Soviet Russia Today. Marcel Scherer was assigned to organize technicians around the atomic radiation laboratories at the University of California at Berkeley and also, some time ago, was before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives where his testimony followed the usual party line.

This plant is manufacturing items urgently needed in connection with important Atomic Energy Commission projects to enlarge facilities required by the accelerated production program authorized by Congress. It also manufactures vital air compressors and pumps for battle-ships and submarines of our Asia-cruising Navy. These words were used in a telegram by the Atomic Energy Commission who wired the local strike leaders who have kept their men out of the crucial plant for over 6 weeks now:

Increased atomic energy production is so vital to the security of our Nation that we have requested Ingersoll-Rand to make every effort to meet the required delivery date in order not to delay completion of an important unit in the program.

The president of the striking local replied:

Will cooperate fully with Ingersoll-Rand and the Government to help meet delivery date on items being manufactured.

But the picket lines never opened. No man was permitted into the plant even though the local union leaders met with company executives and worked out all details, even to the names of the men who would be permitted to go in and finish the required pumps for the Oak Ridge atom bomb base. This was on July 20. The union strikers, whose loyalty to their country need not be doubted, met and decided to vote by secret ballot on whether to permit the specialists into the plant to finish the AEC orders. Secret ballots were actually printed, but they were never used at the next meeting. Instead, as reported in the column of Victor Riesel in the New York Daily News, someone convinced the local officers to call for a voice vote and you know what happened. What happened was that the international representatives sent in from the international headquarters in New York City, virtually all with weird pro-Communist records, had reversed the sentiment at the special interim meeting on the plant lawn and the secret ballots were junked.

Mr. Riesel goes on to state that Ingersoll-Rand Co. went to the unions at its other plants—the truly clean and crusading International Association of Machinists at the Athens, Pa., factory and Philip Murray's new International Union of Electrical Workers, CIO, in the Painted Post, N. J., installation and asked them to open their picket lines so special Army, Navy, and Atomic Energy Commission work could be completed, and it was done almost immediately and the material is moving to military depots.

The difference between the unions is that the one organization is controlled by a handful of party workers who exert power, tremendous control, and pressure over thousands of workers who have no use for the Stalinism which is killing our GI's in Korea.

This man Scherer is also the individual who is now running Moscow's notorious peace petition drive out of New York City, and the same individual who was cited for contempt of Congress for his refusal to answer questions only a few short days ago.

Why were they called out on strike on the afternoon of the North Korean in-

vasion, and why did that strike call come after slowdowns and just before the company was to bring in its written offer of a raise? The answer is obvious.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, we recall in 1916 an administration was elected to power because it promised to keep us out of war; in 1940 the same administration was returned to power, as we all recall, on a promise made "again, again, and again" that American boys would not have to fight and die on foreign soil; and now, today, for the third time we are engaged in a war and Congress has not declared it.

This time, Mr. Speaker, the ridiculous charge has been made by some candidates for Congress and left-wing New Dealers in the Democratic Party that the Republicans are to be blamed for the Korean debacle because we did not vote for aid to Korea early this year. Nothing could be more stupid or unfair. A school child should know that it would have been folly to give economic and meager military aid to Korea without backing it up with full military aid for the Far East, including Formosa.

The records prove that the northern Koreans now have control of practically all of Korea, which means that the \$60,000,000 worth of economic aid voted by the Congress, if spent, would now be in the hands of our enemies. This is a concrete example of the folly of this administration relative to our Far East program.

At the time of the debate on this subject of aid for Korea it was testified by military leaders, as well as the heads of our Department of State, that we could not defend Korea should the Communists decide to invade. That there would be a definite threat of the capture of any equipment or industrial plants that might be in the invasion territory. Time and results have shown these statements were true.

I voted against the Korean aid bill because it was proven to me beyond a doubt that it would be inadvisable to send economic aid and a token military aid to build up a rich prize for our enemies unless we were willing to make an all-out effort to defend it.

In my opinion, the positive and negative position of this administration in the Far East aid program has placed us in the position we are now in. I firmly believe we are in war, and I am willing to go along with all good Americans to give every aid and assistance to the winning of this conflict. However, I do feel that those in our State Department responsible for a change in our Far East policy should not continue in control but be replaced by someone having definite knowledge of existing conditions and the importance of the program from an international viewpoint. And, certainly, that those in control of this program should not be friendly with those who associate with Communists.

We cannot fight communism in the Far East and allow it to run rampant

in our own country, yes, even in our own Federal departments.

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], quoting from a letter received from Postmaster General Donaldson respecting the April 17 curtailment order of mail delivery, said that the Postmaster General had indicated that the savings as a result of that cut would be \$70,000,000. I am rather surprised to hear those figures, inasmuch as the Postmaster General in his appearances before House and Senate committees shortly after issuing that order testified that the saving at the best would be \$25,000,000, possibly would not run over \$15,000,000.

The Postmaster General has \$70,000,000 in mind, of course, because when he came down here to appear on his requests for the fiscal year 1951 he was \$42,000,000 short. That amount had been cut from his request by the Bureau of the Budget, which held that he had overestimated the volume of mail for the new fiscal year and had run too high on his calculations. It was afterward that the House cut his requests \$28,000,000, a cut which was sustained by the Senate; \$42,000,000 plus \$28,000,000 gives you \$70,000,000. So if it be true now that there is a deficiency of \$70,000,000 in the Postmaster General's budget for the fiscal year 1951 he is proceeding to apply it entirely to mail deliveries in the United States.

Firms having important war contracts are joining the New York Times and other leading newspapers in pointing out that this is economy in reverse and we must not forget that the GI on the battlefields looks forward so much to mail call. And the loved ones at home do not relish any delay in the receipt of their mail. The British insist on maintaining their high standard of a minimum of two deliveries a day. So should we, particularly at a time when morale means so much to the preservation of what we call our way of life.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States in his wisdom, and as I understand, for the first time in the history of our country, selected a Postmaster General who had come up through the postal ranks, and who perhaps knows more about the Post Office Department than any man who ever occupied that position. I thoroughly approved of the President's action in that regard, and I consider the operation of the Post Office Department as an administrative job, not a legislative one.

I refused to sign discharge petition 31 and announced that I was opposed to

the legislation it favors and that rescinds the Postmaster General's order cutting back to within his budget. I felt that he was within his right and performing his duty when he did so.

I believe in the appointment of experienced men to these jobs; men who understand them. I approved my predecessor's—Hon. Louis Ludlow's—nomination of a postmaster in Indianapolis who was a career man, but whose appointment had not been made or confirmed. I made the statement publicly that I was not going to appoint any man as postmaster who did not know the difference between a mail truck and a sulky plow. Now we have an able man as Postmaster General. We did not appropriate the money with which to operate the Post Office Department. He knows better where the necessary cutback should be than we can ever know. I just want to say this, also: it is going to be interesting to note the votes to rescind the order of the Postmaster General and to compare those with the votes of those who have been talking about economy here on the floor of this House.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman from Indiana find fault with the President of the United States or the Bureau of the Budget when in transmitting the 1951 request of the Postmaster General he indicated that they had cut those requests some \$42,000,000?

Mr. JACOBS. No; I am not finding fault with having cut the amount, but we came here on the floor of this House with a revision of postal rates and we did not show the courage to lay down the proper rates to make up the amount of money that it takes to run the Post Office Department.

Mr. CANFIELD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] read from the Record here this morning where the proper committee called the Postmaster General in and asked him to rearrange the operation down to one delivery per day. He read it from the Record and no one disputed it. Now here is the case: We call the Postmaster General up here and we ask him to cut back to one delivery a day and now we are going to pass a bill and tell him that he must increase it to two deliveries a day. How is he going to do that if he does not have the money? As far as I am concerned I am not going to tell the Postmaster General that he must not do something and then tell him he must do it and then not give him the money to do it with.

This Congress will make itself look silly with that "on agin, off agin, gone agin, Pinagin" political ping-pong.

If additional funds are needed for proper functioning of the Post Office Department, let us forthrightly appropriate them. But let us quit crawling and dogtrotting on the question.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. O'HARA of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GORDON) for Monday through Wednesday, August 14, 15, and 16, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. LEFEVRE (at the request of Mr. POULSON) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

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

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. CURTIS) was given permission to extend his remarks.

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

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

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 602. An act for the relief of Fritz Busche;

H. R. 4136. An act for the relief of Helen M. Booth;

H. R. 4832. An act for the relief of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio;

H. R. 4989. An act to provide for the payment of just compensation to John H. Estate Ltd., a Hawaiian corporation, for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 9023. An act to amend the Hatch Act; and

H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray (1) the Civil War, (2) the Spanish-American War, and (3) the birth of aviation in the United States.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 11, 1950:

H. R. 612. An act for the relief of Col. W. M. Chubb;

H. R. 1618. An act for the relief of Kenneth J. MacKenzie;

H. R. 1922. An act to amend section 10 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Fry;

H. R. 2350. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion M. Martin Jones;

H. R. 2850. An act for the relief of John F. Oettl;

H. R. 2854. An act for the relief of Wade H. Noland;

H. R. 3605. An act to provide for documentation of the Canadian-built vessel *North Wind* owned by a citizen of the United States;

H. R. 4065. An act to provide for the relinquishment of mineral reservations in the land patent of Thomas Stephens;

H. R. 4117. An act to remove the present restriction relating to the granting of privileges within Kings Canyon National Park in order that privileges hereafter granted may be consistent with those granted in other areas of the National Park System, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5157. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Anthony Albanese, a minor;

H. R. 5282. An act to amend section 3 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 6657. An act for the relief of Georges Jules Louis Sauvage;

H. R. 6850. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. F. A. Ferguson;

H. R. 6959. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Watt;

H. R. 6960. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to James Wilbur Watt;

H. R. 6961. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary E. Watt;

H. R. 6963. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Guy L. Heckenlively;

H. R. 6964. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Josephine Stevens Goering;

H. R. 7043. An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road or public toll road through the wildlife refuge located in Princess Anne County, Va.;

H. R. 7192. An act to provide benefits for the widows of certain persons who were retired or are eligible for retirement under section 6 of the act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1918, as amended;

H. R. 7253. An act for the relief of Charles Wilson Roland and Mirtle L. Roland;

H. R. 7293. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charlotte Gelsdorff Kibby;

H. R. 7294. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Rebecca Collins Ross;

H. R. 7431. An act for expenditures of funds for cooperating with the public school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7540. An act for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis;

H. R. 7773. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;

H. R. 7869. An act to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Newnan, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia;

H. R. 7887. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an amendment to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Compact, and repealing the limitation on the life of such compact;

H. R. 8144. An act to authorize the sale of a small tract of land at Great Falls, Mont.;

H. R. 8450. An act for the relief of Ralef Neahem, Iffef Neahem, and Ihnen Neahem;

H. R. 8597. An act to permit national banks to give security in the form required by

State law for deposits of funds by local public agencies and officers;

H. R. 8767. An act 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;

H. R. 8792. An act to amend the statute relating to certificates of trade-mark registrations;

H. R. 8845. An act to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Kennebec County, Maine, to the town of Chelsea;

H. R. 8923. An act to provide improved procedures with respect to the financial control of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8944. An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 9074. An act to amend chapter 61 (relating to lotteries) of title 18, United States Code, to make clear that such chapter does not apply to nonprofit contests where prizes are awarded for the specie, size, weight, or quality of fish caught by the contestant;

H. R. 9120. An act to amend section 322 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. J. Res. 453. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the First United States International Trade Fair, to be held at Chicago, Ill., August 7 through 20, 1950;

H. J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Mid-Century International Exposition, Inc., New Orleans, La. to be admitted without payment of tariff and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 496. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Food Exposition, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 501. Joint resolution to authorize the procurement of an oil portrait and a marble bust of the late Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone.

On August 14, 1950:

H. R. 602. An act for the relief of Fritz Busche;

H. R. 4136. An act for the relief of Helen M. Booth;

H. R. 4832. An act for the relief of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio;

H. R. 4989. An act to provide for the payment of just compensation to John H. Estate Ltd., a Hawaii corporation, for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, T. H.; and

H. R. 9023. An act to amend the Hatch Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 15, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1626. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, covering operations during the calendar year 1949, pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1627. A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, for the year ended December 31, 1949, pursuant to paragraph 20 of section 8 of an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2423. An act to amend section 7 of the act of February 27, 1925 (43 Stat. 1008), relating to the Osage Indians of Oklahoma; with amendment (Rept. No. 2913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee of conference. House Joint Resolution 238. Joint resolution to remove the racial restrictions on naturalization in the case of certain Japanese persons who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924; without amendment (Rept. No. 2914). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 8797. A bill to exempt property of the Young Men's Christian Association of the city of Washington (incorporated under the act of Congress of June 28, 1864, 13 Stat. L. 411) from taxation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2912). 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. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 9427. A bill to provide for the installation of improvements and facilities needed for the protection, development, and utilization of Federal resources affected by dam and water reservoir projects constructed by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARDEN (by request):

H. R. 9428. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to promote the development and adoption of plans and programs for the improvement of the skills of the Nation's work force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9429. A bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 9430. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), to simplify administration in the Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 9431. A bill to provide for the construction and maintenance of the National

Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Theater; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 9432. A bill for the relief of Susanna Johanna Clara Jungbauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 9433. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toshiko Harada Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 9434. A bill for the relief of Christina Shalfeiff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2332. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Jose Cestero Guardiola, secretary, government of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., expressing appreciation for the enactment of legislation authorizing the Puerto Ricans to write and adopt a constitution, as embodied in Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 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 who art the living reality behind and beyond all life's fleeting shadows, in these dark days filled with alarms of war and of rumors of wars, as the forces of freedom mass their material might against rampant evil which seeks to enslave the world, may there shine in splendor before our eyes the spiritual objectives for which we fight. Keep us, we beseech Thee, vividly aware that the battle which rages can never be won by force of arms alone.

In this historic Chamber within whose walls in the vanished yesterdays the faith of democracy was proclaimed by eloquent voices, may we this day lift with confidence and gratitude the banners which proclaim our faith in the sovereignty of God and the dignity of man. We humbly pray that we may be commissioned to open the gates of a new life for the multitudes now enduring privation and exploitation, fear, and frustration. By Thy grace bring us at last to a nobler and better tomorrow with freedom and equality and justice for all, where Thine shall be the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 14, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 14, 1950, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Kyra Kite Riddle;

S. 2018. An act to authorize advancements to and the reimbursement of certain agencies of the Treasury Department for services performed for other Government agencies, and for other purposes; and

S. 2242. An act for the relief of John E. Dwyer.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WILLIAMS was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not intend to take advantage of the leave accorded to me if during that time there is to be a vote on the unfinished business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Finance Committee may meet this afternoon. We are making every effort to bring a tax bill before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hendrickson	Morse
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Benton	Hill	Murray
Brewster	Hoey	Myers
Bricker	Holland	Neely
Butler	Humphrey	O'Connor
Byrd	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Ives	Pepper
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Darby	Kem	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Downey	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Taft
Eastland	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Eaton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Lucas	Tydings
Frear	McCarran	Watkins
Fulbright	McKellar	Wherry
George	McMahon	Wiley
Gillette	Magnuson	Williams
Graham	Malone	Withers
Green	Martin	Young
Gurney	Maybank	
Hayden	Millikin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the Senator from Idaho