Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 23, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 27, 1951)

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

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, dean, Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, maker of the stars, master of the nations of earth, we ask Thy favor on our country engaged in the audacious and ever-challenging experiment of democracy;

That we may never grow weary of our task because of its difficulties, nor doubt the final triumph of our aims, grant to us unconquerable faith, an unswerving belief in men, a confidence that truth if made known will win its way, and infinite patience;

Grant us flexibility of mind, a willingness to try new experiments, that we may create the conditions which make men free and equal, enhance human dignity and self-respect, and establish a fair measure of economic security for our people;

Bind upon each of us a stern sense of our individual accountability to Thee, that we may always devise those things which are just, and rising above group or sectional prejudice, make the good of all our aim. So may we take our place among those who labor that government of the people, by the people, and for the people may not perish from the earth.

O Heavenly Father, bless our country that it may be a blessing to the world; grant that our aspirations may be in accordance with Thy will, and help us to see ourselves as others see us. Keep us from hypocrisy in feeling or action. Grant us sound government and just laws, good education, and a clean press, simplicity and justice in our relations with one another, and, above all, a spirit of service which will abolish pride of place and inequality of opportunity;

In God's name we ask all these things. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 20, 1951, 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 July 23, 1951, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 51. An act for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen; and

S. 699. An act for the relief of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1717) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. TALLE had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

MIDYEAR ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 190)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1951.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith a midyear economic report to the Congress. This is supplementary to the Economic Report of the President of January 12, 1951, and is transmitted in accordance with section 3 (b) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, The Economic Situation at Midyear 1951, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of the 20th instant,

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, reported it on July 21, 1951, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 561) thereon.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be excused from attending sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow on official business, inspecting the flood damage in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma: The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order, the Senate will proceed with the call of the calendar.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before we start on the call of the calendar, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

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

GENERAL MACARTHUR—RESOLUTION OF NORTH CONWAY (N. H.) WOMAN'S CLUB

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the North Conway Woman's Club, of North

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Conway, N. H., relating to support of General MacArthur. I commend the reading of the resolution to my colleagues.

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

Whereas the present world situation is one of tenseness and unrest and the forces of communism are on the offensive everywhere, with our husbands and sons already committed to battle in Korea against such forces, it is our well-considered opinion that leaders of our American men should be backed 100 percent by we who are at home: Therefore be it

Resolved by the North Conway Woman's Club in meeting assembled—

1. That we support and endorse an all-out effort to crush communism wherever it threatens our well-being;

2. That we endorse and give our wholehearted support to Gen. Douglas MacArthur and commend him for his efforts:

3. That we urge our public officials, and especially the Senators and Congressmen from New Hampshire, to support in every way possible the afore-mentioned General MacArthur in his plans and policies for bringing the present struggle to a successful conclusion;

4. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Senator Styles Bridges, Senator Charles Tobey, Representative Norris Cotton, Representative Chester Merrow, Gov. Sherman Adams, Mrs. Dexter O. Arnold, president of the New Hampshire Federation of Woman's Clubs.

ANNA D. MARTIN
(Mrs. Thomas Martin),
President.

A true copy:
Attest:

ERNESTINE B. RABETHGE
(Mrs. Arthur Rabethge),
Secretary.

REPORTS OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEES

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JUNE 30, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Ena Bartosh, stenographer (from June 1)	$3,285.36	$270.00
Ruth G. Benning, stenographer (Jan. 23 to Mar. 16)	3,546.08	515.16
Horace W. Busby, investigator (intermittently)	10,846.00	1,750.00
Evelyn D. DeSimone, stenographer (from Mar. 12)	3,546.08	1,020.60
Harold M. Devlin, accountant (from Mar. 17)	8,521.88	2,475.10
Fred A. Dewey, attorney (from May 31)	8,521.88	723.85
Wallace L. Engle, investigator	4,328.19	2,104.28
Dorothy Fipp, stenographer (Jan. 19 to May 5)	3,546.08	1,040.04
George T. Gilman, investigator (from Apr. 9)	4,849.61	1,103.37
David Ginsburg, attorney (from Mar. 14)	$8,853.69	$2,643.25
Irving Goldberg, consultant (total of 5 days)	10,846.00	125.00
David L. Goodman, stenographer (Mar. 12 to May 22)	3,719.87	733.68
Arthur D. Horner, investigator	6,500.74	3,250.37
Helen S. Karpowicz, stenographer (to Feb. 15)	3,806.78	479.32
Mary F. Keadle, stenographer (from June 11)	3,285.36	180.00
D. F. McGillicuddy, attorney (from Apr. 5)	6,500.74	1,549.47
Kurt W. Melchior, attorney (from June 25)	3,806.78	62.52
Jos. F. Mullins, Jr., clerk messenger (from June 4)	2,450.91	181.44
Dorothy J. Nichols, assistant administrative clerk	4,936.51	2,405.23
Martha J. Phillips, stenographer (from June 1)	3,623.97	298.50
Paul M. Popple, investigator (from Mar. 14)	6,500.74	1,941.29
George E. Reedy, staff consultant (from Apr. 23)	9,019.59	1,704.99
Richard O. Ridgeway, investigator (to Feb. 17)	6,500.74	854.89
Robert B. Sheldon, investigator (to Jan. 8)	6,500.74	142.48
Edgar G. Shelton, Jr., editorial assistant to chairman	6,500.74	2,984.66
Raymond G. Sowder, clerk-messenger (Apr. 2 to May 22)	2,132.13	297.84
Willie Day Taylor, stenographer (Jan. 1 to Mar. 12 and May 18 to June 3)	3,806.78	863.22
Lyon L. Tyler, Jr., assistant chief counsel	10,015.02	4,597.20
B. Gladys Walstad, stenographer (from Mar. 5)	3,806.78	1,230.74
John, Wildenthal, Jr., stenographer	3,632.97	1,213.90
Leona J. Wirt, stenographer (Mar. 2 to June 6)	3,546.08	942.88
Dr. Howard S. Piquet (Library of Congress reimbursed for salary Feb. 1 to June 30)	10,750.00	2,331.93
Lawrence P. Sherfy, attorney (Department of Justice reimbursed for salary Apr. 28 to June 9)	9,000.00	1,038.45

Balance unexpended, Jan. 1, 1951	$7,152.95
Amount expended	7,150.47
Balance unexpended, Jan. 31, 1951	2.48
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure under S. Res. 18	190,000.00
Amount expended	43,695.72
Balance unexpended	146,304.28

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Preparedness Subcommittee.

JUNE 30, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION MAKING INVESTIGATIONS UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 228, AGREED TO FEBRUARY 27, 1950, AND SENATE RESOLUTION 6, AGREED TO JANUARY 28, 1951

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees under Senate Resolution 228 from January 1, 1951, to January 31, 1951, and under Senate Resolution 6 from February 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Richard Arens, staff director:		
S. Res. 228	$10,846.00	$903.83
S. Res. 6	10,846.00	4,519.15
John M. Barry, staff member (to Mar. 31, 1951), S. Res. 6	3,111.57	518.58
Drury H. Blair, staff member:		
S. Res. 228	$8,024.17	$668.68
S. Res. 6	8,604.83	3,536.92
Patricia A. Dales, stenographer (to Feb. 28, 1951):		
S. Res. 228	5,023.41	418.61
S. Res. 6	5,023.41	418.61
Dorothy A. Davis, stenographer:		
S. Res. 228	5,023.41	418.61
S. Res. 6	5,023.41	2,093.05
Owen K. Earl, staff member (from Apr. 1, 1951), S. Res. 6	5,023.41	1,053.07
Oliver Eastland, attorney (from Apr. 12, 1951), S. Res. 6	7,858.27	1,724.44
Jean C. Eells, assistant clerk (from Apr. 23, 1951), S. Res. 6	3,632.97	686.21
Stephen G. Haaser, stenographer:		
S. Res. 228	4,415.10	367.92
S. Res. 6	4,849.61	1,912.02
Elizabeth R. Heckman, stenographer (to Mar. 31, 1951):		
S. Res. 228	5,023.41	418.61
S. Res. 6	5,023.41	837.22
George H. Himes, typist (to Feb. 1, 1951), S. Res. 228	2,048.97	170.74
Ethel L. Johnson, staff member:		
S. Res. 228	7,609.41	634.11
S. Res. 6	8,024.17	3,308.83
Lucille Krocak, stenographer (to June 15, 1951):		
S. Res. 228	3,024.66	252.05
S. Res. 6	3,024.66	1,134.22
Mary J. McCloskey, stenographer:		
S. Res. 228	5,023.41	418.61
S. Res. 6	5,023.41	2,093.05
Guy M. Massey, staff member:		
S. Res. 228	8,024.17	668.68
S. Res. 6	8,604.83	3,536.92
Margaret M. Mechling, stenographer (from Apr. 1, 1951), S. Res. 6	5,023.41	1,255.83
Fred M. Mesmer, staff member:		
S. Res. 228	8,024.17	668.68
S. Res. 6	8,604.83	3,536.92
Mary G. Micheo, assistant clerk (from June 24, 1951), S. Res. 6	3,980.59	77.39
Marjorie W. Pence, stenographer (to June 15, 1951):		
S. Res. 228	5,023.41	418.61
S. Res. 6	5,023.41	1,883.74
Mary L. Robinson, stenographer (to Mar. 31, 1951):		
S. Res. 228	5,023.41	418.61
S. Res. 6	5,023.41	837.22
Frank W. Schroeder, investigator:		
S. Res. 228	8,024.17	668.68
S. Res. 6	9,102.55	3,702.84
William H. Webster, stenographer:		
S. Res. 228	4,936.51	411.37
S. Res. 6	5,023.41	2,071.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure:	
Balance under S. Res. 228	$8,243.47
S. Res. 6	97,000.00
Amount expended:	
S. Res. 228	8,129.18
S. Res. 6	40,859.51
Balance unexpended:	
S. Res. 228	114.29
S. Res. 6	56,140.49

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1879. A bill for the relief of Ernest Nanpei Ihrig; and

S. 1880 (by request). A bill for the relief of Donald R. Dyson and Kenneth M. Dyson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCFARLAND:

S. 1881. A bill to eliminate compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States from taxable income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

S. 1882. A bill to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, North Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1883. A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1884. A bill for the relief of Judson T. Ortman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS OF FINANCE COMMITTEE RELATING TO REVENUE

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 179), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That 800 additional copies of part 1 and of each subsequent part of the hearings held before the Committee on Finance on (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, be printed for the use of said committee.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 3 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 50, after line 14, insert the following:

"INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

"The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $76,808,000 for the net costs during the fiscal year 1950 under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641–1642)."

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. CHAVEZ) submitted the following notice in writing:

The notice of Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 41, after line 24, insert the following:

"The unexpended balances appropriated for the purposes of section 504 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949 by the General Appropriation Act of 1951, shall hereafter be available for the additional purposes of making grants and the grant portion of combination loans and grants for the purposes of the act of August 28, 1937, 'To promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization and for other purposes.'"

Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. CHAVEZ) also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CHAVEZ to House bill 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Brig. Gen. Claude Henry Chorpening, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and as brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States, and withdrawing the nomination of Mrs. Rufina W. Gully to be postmaster at Gholson, Miss., which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Martha M. Eliot, of Connecticut, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, vice Katharine F. Lenroot, retired.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address entitled "Crime in America: Its Effect on Foreign Relations," delivered by him at Columbia University on July 10, 1951.

Address entitled "New Atlantic Agreement Needed," delivered by Senator GILLETTE at the Atlantic Union Strategy Conference, Washington, D. C., May 18, 1951.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Editorial on the death of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, published in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, July 23, 1951.

By Mr. LANGER:

Editorial entitled "Rewriting the Constitution," published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune of July 13, 1951.

Article entitled "Writer Explains Why Pick-Sloan Plan Won't Work," written by Richard Baumhoff, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Leader of July 19, 1951.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

Article entitled "Bonus Riot of 1932 Back in News," published in the Washington Post of July 22, 1951; also article entitled "Secret Testimony of Commie on Bonus March Made Public," published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 14, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Forestry's Challenge to America," published in the Grand Rapids Herald-Review of July 19, 1951, relating to award to the Chippewa National Forest and its management for most distinguished accomplishment.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Article by James Euchner entitled "Highway Would Honor Claudius Crozet," published in the Sunday magazine of the Richmond Times-Dispatch of July 15, 1951.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Article by Philip W. Porter, relating to Government controls, published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 14, 1951.

Article by George E. Sokolski, entitled "UN and Press," published in the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of July 16, 1951.

Editorial entitled "Covenant on Human Rights," published in the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Richmond, Ind., of July 20, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article entitled "The Faith of an American," by Edgar Rogie Clark.

Article entitled "New Hope for the Seaway," published in the Economist of April 21, 1951, regarding the St. Lawrence seaway.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION AND HOUSING AND RENT ACTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1717) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1956 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, together with a message from the House insisting upon its amendment and requesting a conference with the Senate thereon:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1717) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That this act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951."

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

"PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

"SEC. 101. (a) Section 102 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774, 81st Cong.) is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following sentences: 'In making such designations the President may prescribe such conditions with respect to the accumulation of materials in excess of the reasonable demands of business, personal, or home consumption as he deems necessary to carry out the objectives of this act. This section shall not be construed to limit the

authority contained in sections 101 and 704 of this act.'

"(b) Title I of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended by adding the following section:

"'That import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and no imports of any such commodity or product shall be admitted to the United States until after June 30, 1953, which would (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price-support program.'

"(c) Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No restriction, quota, or other limitation shall be placed upon the quantity of livestock which may be slaughtered or handled by any processor.'

"AUTHORITY TO REQUISITION AND CONDEMN

"SEC. 102. (a) Title II of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding to the heading thereof the words 'and condemn.'

"(b) Section 201 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended—

"(1) By adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new sentence: 'No real property shall be acquired under this subsection.'

"(2) By adding after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"'(b) Whenever the President deems it necessary in the interest of national defense, he may acquire by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer, or may cause proceedings to be instituted in any court having jurisdiction of such proceedings to acquire by condemnation, any real property, including facilities, temporary use thereof, or other interest therein, together with any personal property located thereon or used therewith, that he deems necessary for the national defense, such proceedings to be in accordance with the act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357), as amended, or any other applicable Federal statute. Before condemnation proceedings are instituted pursuant to this section, an effort shall be made to acquire the property involved by negotiation unless, because of reasonable doubt as to the identity of the owner or owners, because of the large number of persons with whom it would be necessary to negotiate, or for other reasons, the effort to acquire by negotiation would involve, in the judgment of the President, such delay in acquiring the property as to be contrary to the interest of national defense. In any condemnation proceeding instituted pursuant to this section, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 percent of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding. Property acquired under this section may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this section prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. Prior to the acquisition of any real property, or interest therein, under the provisions of this section, for the use of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, the Administrator, Director, or head of the agency designated by the President to administer the provisions of this section shall come into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to the terms of such prospective acquisitions.'

"(3) By striking out 'requisitioned' in the presently designated subsection (c), and inserting in lieu thereof 'acquired.'

"(4) By redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

"EXPANSION OF PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY AND SUPPLY

"SEC. 103. (a) Section 303 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 303. (a) To assist in carrying out the objectives of this act, the President may make provision (1) for purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale; and (2) for the encouragement of exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals: *Provided, however,* That purchases for resale under this subsection shall not include that part of the supply of an agricultural commodity which is domestically produced except insofar as such domestically produced supply may be purchased for resale for industrial uses or stockpiling, and no commodity purchased under this subsection shall be sold at less than the established ceiling price for such commodity, or, if no ceiling price has been established, the higher of the following: (i) the current domestic market price for such commodity, or (ii) the minimum sale price established for agricultural commodities owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation as provided in section 407 of Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress: *Provided further, however,* That no purchase or commitment to purchase any agricultural commodity shall be made calling for delivery more than 1 year after the expiration of this act.

"'(b) Subject to the limitations in subsection (a), purchases and commitments to purchase and sales under such subsection may be made without regard to the limitations of existing law, for such quantities, and on such terms and conditions, including advance payments, and for such periods, as the President deems necessary, except that purchases or commitments to purchase involving higher than established ceiling prices (or if there be no established ceiling prices, currently prevailing market prices) or anticipated loss on resale shall not be made unless it is determined that supply of the materials could not be effectively increased at lower prices or on terms more favorable to the Government, or that such purchases are necessary to assure the availability to the United States of overseas supplies.

"'(c) If the President finds—

"'(1) that under generally fair and equitable ceiling prices for any material, there will result a decrease in supplies from high-cost sources of such material, and that the continuation of such supplies is necessary to carry out the objectives of the act; or

"'(2) that an increase in cost of production, distribution, or transportation is temporary in character and threatens to impair maximum production or supply in any area at stable prices of any materials,

he may make provision for subsidy payments on any domestically produced material other than an agricultural commodity in such amounts and in such manner (including purchases of such material and its resale at a loss without regard to the limitations of existing law), and on such terms and conditions, as he determines to be necessary to insure that supplies from such high-cost sources or processors are continued, or that maximum production or supply in such area at stable prices of such materials is maintained, as the case may be.

"'(d) The procurement power granted to the President by this section shall include the power to transport and store and have processed and refined, any materials procured under this section.

"'(e) When in his judgment it will aid the national defense, the President is authorized to install additional equipment, facilities, processes, or improvements to plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by the United States Government, and to install Government-owned equipment in plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by private persons.'

"(b) The presently designated subsection (b) of section 304 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out the proviso in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '*Provided,* That the amount borrowed under the provisions of this section by all such borrowers shall not exceed an aggregate of $2,100,000,000 outstanding at any one time: *Provided, further,* That when any contract, agreement, loan, or other transaction heretofore or hereafter entered into pursuant to section 302 or 303 imposes contingent liability upon the United States, such liability shall be considered for the purposes of sections 3679 and 3732 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, as an obligation only to the extent of the probable ultimate net cost to the United States under such transaction; and the President shall submit a report to the Congress not less often than once each quarter setting forth the gross amount of each such transaction entered into by any agency of the United States Government under this authority and the basis for determining the probable ultimate net cost to the United States thereunder.'

"(c) Section 304 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is further amended by striking out subsection (c).

"PRICE AND WAGE STABILIZATION

"SEC. 104. (I) In the third sentence, following the colon, the word 'and' is inserted in place of the comma appearing after the word 'fluctuations' and all of the language succeeding the word 'transportation' is deleted.

"(II) After the third sentence as thus amended, insert the following additional sentence: 'In determining and adjusting such ceiling prices, the President may also consider general increases or decreases in profits earned subsequent to June 24, 1950, by sellers of a material or persons performing a service: *Provided,* That no decrease of ceiling prices shall be effected and no increase of ceiling prices denied on the sole basis of the comparative profits earned by sellers of a material or persons performing a service prior to and subsequent to June 24, 1950: *And provided further,* That no adjustment of ceiling prices for any material or service shall be denied upon the sole basis of the profits earned by the same seller from sales of other materials or services.'

"(b) Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by inserting after the third sentence thereof the following new sentence: "No ceiling shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity below 90 per centum of the price received (by grade) by producers on May 19, 1951, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.'

"(c) The second sentence of paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended

by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '; and equitable treatment shall be accorded to all such processors.'

"(d) The fifth sentence of paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out 'used for distribution as fluid milk'; by striking out 'parity prices for such milk' and inserting in lieu thereof 'parity prices for milk'; by striking out 'such fluid milk' and insterting in lieu thereof 'milk'; and by striking out 'for fluid milk' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for milk.'

"(e) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out 'Rates or fees charged for professional services' in paragraph (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof 'Rates or fees charged for professional services, or wages, salaries, or other compensation paid for professional services'.

"(f) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(vii) Prices charged and wages paid for services performed by barbers and beauticians.'

"(g) Section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(j) Where the sale or delivery of a material or service makes the person selling or delivering it liable for a State or local gross receipts tax or gross income tax, he may receive for the material or service involved, in addition to the ceiling price, (1) an amount equal to the amount of all such State and local taxes for which the transaction makes him liable, or (2) 1 cent, whichever is greater. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of tax liability shall be computed on shipping units at the ceiling price, and a fractional part of a cent in the amount of tax liability shall be disregarded unless it amounts to one-half cent or more, in which case it shall be increased to 1 cent.'

"(h) Section 402 of the Defense Production Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraphs:

"'(j) No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto shall be issued under this title, which shall deny to a seller of a material at retail or wholesale his customary percentage margin over his cost of the material during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, or on such other nearest representative date determined under section 402 (c), except as to any one specific item of a line of material sold by such seller which is in short supply as evidenced by specific Government action to encourage production of the item in question. No such exception shall reduce such customary margin of sellers at retail or wholesale beyond the amount found by the President, in writing, to be generally equitable and proportionate in relation to the general reductions in the customary margins of all other classes of persons concerned in the production and distribution of the excepted item of material.

"'Prior to making any finding that a specific item of material shall be so excepted, or as to the amount of the reductions in customary margins to be imposed upon retail and wholesale sellers of such item, the President shall consult with representatives of the affected retail and wholesale sellers concerning the basis for and the amount of the exception which is proposed with respect to any such item.

"'For purposes of this section a person is a "seller of a material at retail or wholesale" to the extent that such person purchases and resells an item of material without substantially altering its form; or to the extent that such person sells to ultimate consumers except (1) to Government and institutional consumers and (2) to consumers who purchase for consumption in the course of trade or business.'

"(i) Section 404 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 404. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the President shall advise and consult with, and establish and utilize committees of, representatives of persons substantially affected by regulations or orders issued hereunder, including representatives of businessmen, farmers, workers, and consumers, and, so far as practicable, in carrying out the purposes of this title shall give due weight to their recommendations.'

"(j) Subsection (a) of section 405 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The President shall also prescribe the extent to which any payment made, either in money or property, by any person in violation of any such regulation, order, or requirement shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any such person for the purposes of any other law or regulation, including bases in determining gain for tax purposes.'

"(k) Subsection (a) of section 409 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Whenever in the judgment of the President any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of section 405 of this title, he may make application to any district court of the United States or any United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing by the President that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, with or without such injunction or restraining order, shall be granted without bond.'

"(l) The second sentence of subsection (c) of section 409 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out the words 'but in no event shall such amount exceed the amount of the overcharge, or the overcharges, plus $10,000,'.

"(m) Section 409 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(d) The President shall also prescribe the extent to which any payment made by way of fine pursuant to subsection (b) of this section 409, or any payment made to the United States or to any buyer in compromise or satisfaction of any liability or of any right of action, suit, or judgment, authorized pursuant to subsection (c) of this section 409 for selling any material or service, in violation of a regulation or order providing a ceiling or ceilings, shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any such person for the purposes of any other law or regulation.

"'(e) The term "court of competent jurisdiction" as used in this section shall mean any Federal court of competent jurisdiction regardless of the amount in controversy and any State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction.'

"(n) Section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(j) In establishing or maintaining maximum prices under this act or otherwise in the case of collect-on-delivery sales of any commodity where under established practices of the seller a uniform charge is added to the price to cover mailing costs, an increase in maximum prices shall be allowed equivalent to any increase in such costs heretofore or hereafter resulting from increased postal rates or charges.'

"(o) Paragraph (v) of subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding after the words 'rates charged by any common carrier or other public utility' the words 'whose proposed increase in any rate or charge is subject to control by a Federal, State, municipal, or other public regulatory authority, exercising jurisdiction to approve or disapprove proposed increases in such rates or charges.'

"(p) The fourth sentence of paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows: 'Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or affect the provisions of either (1) the Agricultural Act of 1949, or (2) the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, or to invalidate any marketing agreement, license, or order, or any provision thereof or amendment thereto, heretofore or hereafter made or issued under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.'

"SEC. 105. (a) Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended by changing the period at the end of the first sentence to a colon and adding the following: *'Provided, however,* That the President shall administer any controls over the wages or salaries of employees subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, through a separate board or panel having jurisdiction only over such employees.'

"(b) Section 502 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by changing the period at the end of the last sentence thereof to a colon and adding the following: *'Provided, however,* That in any dispute between employees and carriers subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended, the procedures of such act shall be followed for the purpose of bringing about a settlement of such dispute. Any agency provided for by such act, including any panel or panel board established by the President for the adjustment of disputes arising under the Railway Labor Act, as a prerequisite to effecting or recommending a settlement of such dispute, shall make a specific finding and certification that the changes proposed by such settlement or recommended settlement, are consistent with such standards as may then be in effect, established by or pursuant to law, for the purpose of controlling inflationary tendencies: *Provided further,* That in any nondisputed wage or salary adjustments proposed as a result of voluntary agreement through collective bargaining, mediation, or otherwise, the same finding and certification of consistency with existing stabilization policy shall be made by the separate panel, chairman thereof, or boards as established and authorized by the President. Where such finding and certification are made by such agency, panel, chairman thereof, or boards, they shall after approval by the Economic Stabilization Administrator be conclusive and it shall then be lawful for the employees and carriers, by agreement, to put into effect the changes proposed by the settlement, recommended settlement, or voluntary proposal with respect to which such findings and certification were made.'

"(c) The second sentence of section 503 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended to read as follows: 'No action inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, other Federal labor standards statutes, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, the Railway Labor Act, as amended, or with other applicable laws shall be taken under this title.'

"CONTROL OF CREDIT

"SEC. 106. (a) Section 601 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'In the exercise of its authority under this section, the Board shall not (1) require a down payment of more than one-third or fix a maximum maturity of less than 21 months in connection with installment credit extended for the purchase of a new automobile, or (2) require a down payment of more than one-fourth or fix a maximum maturity of less than 21 months in connection with installment credit extended for the purchase of a used automobile, or (3) require a down payment of more than 15 percent or fix a maximum maturity of less than 18 months in connection with installment credit extended for the purchase of any household appliance (including phonographs and radios and television sets), or (4) require a down payment of more than 10 percent or fix a maximum maturity of less than 21 months in connection with installment credit extended for the purchase of household furniture and floor coverings (the down payments required by the Board in the exercise of its authority under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) may be made in cash, or by trade-in or exchange of property, or by a combination of cash and trade-in or exchange of property), or (5) require a down payment of more than 10 percent or fix a maximum maturity of less than 36 months in connection with installment credit extended for residential repairs, alterations, or improvements or require any down payment on roofing or siding repairs, alterations or improvements in advance of completion thereof. The Board shall recognize freight costs on automobiles and make due allowance by further extending maximum maturities in connection with installment credits extended for the purchase of automobiles so as to equalize as nearly as practicable monthly payments throughout the United States.'

"(b) Subsection (a) of section 602 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'No regulation issued under this section shall prescribe a minimum down payment of more than 10 percent, or a maximum maturity of less than 25 years, in connection with the purchase of any home where the purchase price does not exceed $10,000.'

"(c) Section 603 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 603. Any person who willfully violates any provision of section 601, 602, or 605, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.'

"(d) Section 605 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended (1) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *And provided further*, That no more than 6 percent down payment shall be required in connection with the loan on any home guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and the cost of which home does not exceed $12,000.', and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following sentences: 'Subject to the provision of this section with respect to preserving the relative credit preferences accorded to veterans under existing law, the President may require lenders or borrowers and their successors and assigns to comply with reasonable conditions and requirements, in addition to those provided by other laws, in connection with any loan of a type which has been the subject of action by the President under this section. Such conditions and requirements may vary for classifications of persons or transactions as the President may prescribe, and failure to comply therewith shall constitute a violation of this section.'

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 107. The table of contents of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out 'Authority to requisition' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Authority to requisition and condemn'.

"SEC. 108. (a) Section 701 (b) (ii) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(ii) Such business advisory committees shall be appointed as shall be appropriate for purposes of consultation in the formulation of rules, regulations, or orders, or amendments thereto issued under authority of this act, and in their formation there shall be fair representation for independent small, for medium, and for large business enterprises, for different geographical areas, for trade association members and nonmembers, and for different segments of the industry;'.

"(b) Subsection (c) of section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out 'and having due regard to the needs of new businesses' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'and having due regard to the current competitive position of established business: *Provided*, That the limitations and restrictions imposed on the production of specific items shall not exclude new concerns from a fair and reasonable share of total authorized production'.

"SEC. 109 (a) Subsection (a) of section 703 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following sentence: 'The President is authorized to appoint heads and assistant heads of any such new agencies, and other officials therein of comparable status, and to fix their compensation, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the head of one such agency to be paid at a rate comparable to the compensation paid to the heads of executive departments of the Government, and other such heads, assistant heads, and officials at rates comparable to the compensation paid to the heads and assistant heads of independent agencies of the Government.'

"(b) Section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'No rule, regulation, or order issued under this act which restricts the use of natural gas (either directly, or by restricting the use of facilities for the consumption of natural gas, or in any other manner) shall apply in any State in which a public regulatory agency has authority to restrict the use of natural gas and certifies to the President that it is exercising that authority to the extent necessary to accomplish the objectives of this act.'

"(c) (1) Subsection (a) of section 705 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by inserting after 'take the sworn testimony of,' the following: 'and administer oaths and affirmations to,'.

"(2) Section 705 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is further amended by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively, and by inserting the following new subsection:

"'(d) Whenever the President deems such action to be in the interest of the national defense, he may, while this act is in effect, dispense with any of the statistical work in which any executive department or establishment, by another provision of law, is directed to engage.'

"(d) Subsection (a) of section 706 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out the last eight words thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'or other order, with or without such injunction or restraining order, shall be granted without bond'.

"(e) Subsection (b) of section 706 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out the first two sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following sentences: 'Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the district courts of the United States and the United States courts of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction of violations of this act or any rule, regulation, order, or subpena thereunder, and of all civil actions under this act to enforce any liability or duty created by, or to enjoin any violation of, this act or any rule, regulation, order or subpena thereunder, regardless of the amount in controversy. Any criminal proceeding on account of any such violation may be brought in any district in which any act, failure to act, or transaction constituting the violation occurred.'

"(f) Section 710 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) The President, when he deems such action necessary, may make provision for the printing and distribution of reports, in such number and in such manner as he deems appropriate, concerning the actions taken to carry out the objectives of this act.'

"SEC. 110. (a) Title VII of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding after section 713 the following new section:

"'SEC. 714. (a) (1) It is the sense of the Congress that small-business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of this act. In order to carry out this policy there is hereby created a body corporate under the name "Small Defense Plants Corporation" (hereinafter referred to as the Corporation), which Corporation shall be under the general direction and supervision of the President and shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government. The principal office of the Corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, but the Corporation may establish such branch offices in other places in the United States as may be determined by the Administrator of the Corporation.

"'(2) The Corporation is authorized to obtain money from the Treasury of the United States, for use in the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law, not to exceed a total of $50,000,000 outstanding at any one time. For this purpose appropriations not to exceed $50,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to a revolving fund in the Treasury. Advances shall be made to the Corporation from the revolving fund when requested by the Corporation.

"'(3) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be a person of outstanding qualifications known to be familiar and sympathetic with small-business needs and problems. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. The Administrator shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as Administrator. The Administrator is authorized to appoint two Deputy Administrators to assist in the execution of the functions vested in the Corporation. Deputy Administrators shall be paid at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"'(4) The Corporation shall not have succession, beyond June 30, 1952, except for purposes of liquidation, unless its life is extended beyond such date pursuant to an act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed; to make contracts; to lease such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business; to sue and be sued, to compain and to de-

fend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal; to select and employ such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of business of the Corporation; to define their authority and duties, require bonds of them, and fix the penalties thereof; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its Administrator, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted and the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed. The Administration shall determine and prescribe the manner in which the Corporation's obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid. The Corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government. The Corporation, with the consent of any board, commission, independent establishment, or executive department of the Government, may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, including any field service thereof, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this section.

"'(5) All moneys of the Corporation not otherwise employed may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States subject to check by authority of the Corporation or in any Federal Reserve bank. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers conferred by this section. All insured banks, when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall act as depositaries, custodians, and financial agents for the Corporation.

"'(b) (1) The Corporation is empowered—

"'(A) to recommend to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans or advances, on such terms and conditions and with such maturities as it may determine, to enable small-business concerns to finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion, including the acquisition of land; or finance the acquisition of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies, or materials; or to finance research, development, and experimental work or new or improved products or processes; or to supply such concerns with capital to be used in the manufacture of articles, equipment, supplies, or materials for defense or essential civilian purposes; or to establish and operate technical laboratories to serve small-business concerns; such loans or advances to be made or effected either directly by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise;

"'(B) to purchase or lease such land; to purchase, lease, build, or expand such plants; and to purchase or produce such equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies, as may be needed to enable the Corporation to provide small-business concerns with such land, plants, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies as such concerns may require to engage in the production of such articles, equipment, supplies, or materials;

"'(C) to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of to any small-business concern any such land, plants, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies;

"'(D) to enter into contracts with the United States Government and any department, agency, or officer thereof having procurement powers obligating the Corporation to furnish articles, equipment, supplies, or materials to the Government;

"'(E) to arrange for the performance of such contracts by letting subcontracts to small-business concerns or others for the manufacture, supply, or assembly of such articles, equipment, supplies, or materials, or parts thereof, or servicing or processing in connection therewith, or such management services as may be necessary to enable the Corporation to perform such contracts; and

"'(F) to provide technical and managerial aids to small-business concerns conducting and stimulating technical research, by maintaining a clearing house for technical information, by cooperating with other Government agencies, by disseminating information, and by such other activities as are deemed appropriate by the Corporation.

"'(2) In any case in which the Corporation certifies to any officer of the Government having procurement powers that the Corporation is competent to perform any specific Government procurement contract to be let by any such officer, such officer shall be required to let such procurement contract to the Corporation upon such terms and conditions as may be specified by the Corporation. Such subcontracts may be let upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may deem appropriate in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed under section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, as amended.

"'(c) (1) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this section, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

"'(2) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (A) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (B) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Corporation, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (C) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation; or (D) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Corporation which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Corporation, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"'(d) Whenever the Corporation has completed any transaction under clause (B), or (C) of subsection (b) (1) of this section, it may transfer the plant, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, supplies, leases, or other property resulting from such transaction to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall service and administer such property, as the agent of the Corporation, remitting to it any interest, principal, or other proceeds or collections, after deducting actual expense of service and administration.

"'(e) (1) It shall be the duty of the Corporation, and it is hereby empowered, to coordinate and to determine the means by which the productive capacity of small-business concerns can be most effectively utilized for national defense and essential civilian production.

"'(2) It shall be the duty of the Corporation, and it is hereby empowered, to consult and cooperate with appropriate governmental agencies in the issuance of all orders limiting production by business enterprises, in order that small-business concerns will be most effectively utilized in the production of articles, equipment, supplies, and materials for national defense and essential civilian purposes.

"'(3) All governmental agencies are required, before issuing orders limiting production by or granting priorities to business enterprises, to consult and cooperate with the Corporation in order that small-business concerns will be most effectively utilized in the production of articles, equipment, supplies, and materials for national defense and essential civilian purposes.

"'(f) The Corporation shall have the power, and it is hereby directed, whenever it determines such action is necessary—

"'(1) to make a complete inventory of all productive facilities of small-business concerns which can be used for defense and essential civilian production or to arrange for such inventory to be made by any other governmental agency which has the facilities: *Provided*, That in making such inventory the appropriate agencies in the several States shall be requested to furnish an inventory of the productive facilities of small-business concerns in each respective State, if such an inventory is available or in prospect;

"'(2) to consult and cooperate with officers of the Government having procurement powers, in order to utilize the potential productive capacity of plants operated by small-business concerns;

"'(3) to obtain detailed information as to the methods and terms which Government prime contractors utilize in letting subcontracts and to take action to insure the letting of subcontracts by prime contractors to small-business concerns at prices and on conditions and terms which are fair and equitable;

"'(4) to take such action in the letting of Government procurement contracts as is necessary to provide small-business concerns with an adequate incentive to engage in defense and essential civilian production and to facilitate the conversion and the equipping of plants of small-business concerns for such production;

"'(5) to certify to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any of its subsidiaries, the amount of funds required to convert to defense production any plant of a small-business concern interested in obtaining from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any of its subsidiaries, the funds necessary to provide for such conversion;

"'(6) to determine within any industry the concerns, firms, persons, corporations, partnerships, cooperatives, or other business enterprises, which are to be designated "small-business concerns" for the purpose of effectuating the provisions of this section;

"'(7) to certify to Government procurement officers with respect to the competency, as to capacity and credit, of any small-business concern or group of such concerns to perform a specific Government procurement contract;

"'(8) to obtain from any Federal department, establishment, or agency engaged in defense procurement or in the financing of defense procurement or production such reports concerning the letting of contracts and subcontracts and making of loans to business concerns as it may deem pertinent in carrying out its functions under this section;

"'(9) to obtain from suppliers of materials information pertaining to the method of filling orders and the bases for allocating their supply whenever it appears that any small business is unable to obtain materials for defense or essential civilian production from its normal sources;

"'(10) to make studies and recommendations to the appropriate Federal agencies to insure a fair and equitable share of materials, supplies, and equipment to small-business concerns to effectuate the defense program or for essential civilian purposes;

"'(11) to consult and cooperate with all Government agencies for the purpose of insuring that small-business concerns shall receive fair and reasonable treatment from said agencies; and

"'(12) to establish such advisory boards and committees wholly representative of small business as may be found necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.

"'(g) (1) In any case in which a small-business concern or group of such concerns has been certified by or under the authority of the Corporation to be a competent Government contractor with respect to capacity and credit as to a specific Government procurement contract, the officers of the Government having procurement powers are directed to accept such certification as conclusive, and are authorized to let such Government procurement contract to such concern or group of concerns without requiring it to meet any other requirement with respect to capacity and credit.

"'(2) The Congress has as its policy that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government shall be placed with small-business concerns. To effectuate such policy small-business concerns within the meaning of this section shall receive any award or contract or any part thereof if it is determined by the Corporation and the contracting procurement agencies (A) to be in the interest of mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity, or (B) to be in the interest of the national defense program.

"'(3) No certificate of necessity, afforded under section 124A (e) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be granted a prime or subcontractor for the construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, or acquisition of a facility for the production of any material when productive facilities are available which can reasonably meet the same need.

"'(4) Whenever materials or supplies are allocated by law, a fair and equitable percentage thereof shall be made available to the Corporation, to be allocated by it to small plants unable to obtain the necessary materials or supplies from usual sources. Such percentage shall be determined by the head of the lawful allocating authority after giving full consideration to the claims presented by the Corporation.

"'(h) The Corporation shall make a report every 90 days of operations under this section to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such report shall include the names of the business concerns to whom contracts are let, and for whom financing is arranged by the Corporation, together with the amounts involved, and such report shall include such other information, and such comments and recommendations, with respect to the relation of small-business concerns to the defense effort, as the Corporation may deem appropriate.

"'(i) The Corporation is hereby empowered to make studies of the effect of price, credit, and other controls imposed under the defense program and, whenever it finds that these controls discriminate against or impose undue hardship upon small business, to make recommendations to the appropriate Federal agency for the adjustment of controls to the needs of small business.

"'(j) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans and advances upon the recommendation of the Small Defense Plants Corporation as provided in (b) (1) (A) of this section, not to exceed an aggregate of $100,000,000 outstanding at any one time, on such terms and conditions and with such maturities as Reconstruction Finance Corporation may determine.

"'(k) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by inserting immediately after "Commodity Credit Corporation;" the following: "Small Defense Plants Corporation;".

"'(l) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate for the carrying out of the provisions and purposes of this section.'

"(b) The presently designated sections 714, 715, and 716 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 are redesignated as sections 715, 716, and 717, respectively.

"SEC. 111. The presently designated section 716 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out subsections (a) and (b), by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively, and by inserting the following new subsection:

"'(a) This act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1952.'

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947

"SEC. 201. Section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out 'July 31, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1952.'

"SEC. 202. (a) The Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out 'Housing Expediter' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'President.'

"(b) Section 204 (a) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is repealed.

"(c) Section 206 (e) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out 'The principal office of the Housing Expediter shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place and attorneys' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Attorneys.'

"(d) Section 208 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 208. The President shall administer the powers, duties, and functions conferred upon him by title II of this act through the new independent agency created pursuant to section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950; and he shall administer the powers, duties, and functions conferred upon him by title I of this act through such officer or agency of the Government as he may designate. In accordance with the action taken by him pursuant to the preceding sentence, the President shall provide for appropriate transfers of records, property, necessary personnel, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds heretofore under the jurisdiction of, or available to, the Office of the Housing Expediter. Any employees of the Office of Housing Expediter not so transferred shall, unless transferred to other positions in the Government, be separated from the service. The President shall make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate for the termination and liquidation of the affairs of the Office of the Housing Expediter. For the purposes of determining the status of employees transferred to the agency administering functions provided for in this act, and in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, they shall be deemed to be transferred in connection with a transfer of functions.'

"SEC. 203. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(k) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the President shall by regulation or order establish such maximum rent or maximum rents as in his judgment will be fair and equitable for any housing accommodations (1) in any State which by law declares that there exists such a shortage in rental housing accommodations as to require Federal rent control in such State, or (2) in any incorporated city, town, village, or in the unincorporated area of any county (other than a city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county within a State which is controlling rents) upon receipt of a resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose in accordance with applicable local law and based upon a finding by such governing body, reached as a result of a public hearing held after 10 days' notice, that there exists such a shortage in rental housing accommodations as to require Federal rent control in such city, town, village, or unincorporated area in such county. In establishing any maximum rent for any housing accommodations under this subsection the President shall give due consideration to the rents prevailing for such housing accommodations or comparable housing accommodations during the period from May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, and he shall make adjustment for such relevant factors as he shall deem to be of general applicability in respect to such accommodations including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such area.

"'(l) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, whenever the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Defense Mobilization, acting jointly, shall determine and certify to the President that any defense-rental area (whether then or ever controlled or decontrolled under this act or under State or local law) is a critical defense housing area, the President shall by regulation or order establish such maximum rent or maximum rents for any housing accommodations, not then subject to rent control, in such area or portion thereof as in his judgment will be fair and equitable. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 202 (c) the term "controlled housing accommodations" as applied to any such critical defense housing area shall include all housing accommodations in the area, without exception. In establishing any maximum rent for any housing accommodations under this subsection, the President shall give due consideration to the rents prevailing at the time rent control is established, and he shall make adjustment for such relevant factors as he shall determine and deems to be of general applicability in respect to such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such defense-rental areas. Maximum rents in any critical defense housing area shall be terminated at such time as the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Defense Mobilization, acting jointly, shall determine and certify to the President that such area is no longer a critical defense housing area, or as provided in subsection (e) or (j) of this section: *Provided, however,* That in any area where maximum rents are removed under the procedures provided in subsection (e) or (j) of this section, maximum rents may be reestablished after the expiration of 30 days on the determination and certification of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Defense Mobilization, acting jointly. No area shall be certified as a critical defense housing area under the authority granted in this subsection unless all the following conditions exist in such area:

"'(A) a new defense plant or installation has been or is to be provided, or an existing defense plant or installation has been or is to be reactivated or its operation substantially expanded;

"'(B) substantial in-migration of defense workers or military personnel is required to carry out activities at such plant or installation; and

"'(C) a substantial shortage of housing required for such defense workers or military personnel exists or impends which has resulted or threatens to result in excessive rent increases and which impedes or threatens to

impede activities of such defense plant or installation. If any locality which has been decontrolled as a result of action by its local governing body under paragraph (3) of subsection (j) of this section is included in an area certified under this subsection as a critical defense housing area, the President shall promptly notify the local governing body of that fact, and shall not establish any maximum rent for any housing accommodation in the locality until 60 days have elapsed after the date on which such notice is given. If, within such 60-day period, the local governing body adopts a resolution in accordance with applicable local law and based upon a finding by it reached as the result of a public hearing held after 10 days' notice, that any of the conditions listed in paragraphs (A), (B), and (C) of this subsection does not exist in the locality, the certification involved shall have no effect with respect to the locality for the purposes of this subsection and subsection (m) of this section. The preceding two sentences shall not apply with respect to any housing accommodation occupied by, or by the family of, a member of the Armed Forces who is stationed at an Armed Forces installation in or adjacent to the locality.

"'(m) Whenever an area has been certified under subsection (l) to be a critical defense housing area, real-estate construction credit controls imposed under title VI of the Defense Production Act of 1950 shall be suspended with respect to new housing construction in such area, the cost of which does not exceed—

"'(A) $9,000 for single-family dwellings or $16,500 for two-family dwellings, constructed for sale or rent, except that these amounts may be increased to not to exceed $10,000 or $17,500, respectively, in any geographical area where the President finds that cost levels so require: *Provided,* That if the President finds that it is not feasible within the aforesaid dollar-amount limitations to construct dwellings containing three or four bedrooms per family unit without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability, he may increase such dollar-amount limitations by not exceeding $1,200 for each additional bedroom (as defined by the President) in excess of two contained in each family unit if he finds that such unit meets sound standards of livability as a three-bedroom or a four-bedroom unit, as the case may be.

"'(B) $9,000 per family unit (or $8,000 per family unit if the number of rooms in a multifamily rental property or project does not equal or exceed four per family unit) for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use: *Provided,* That the President may by regulation increase such dollar amount limitations by not exceeding $1,000 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require.

In any such critical defense housing area where maximum rents are removed under procedure provided in subsection (e), (j), or (l) of this section the suspension of credit controls provided for in this subsection shall terminate immediately. The fact that any area has been certified as a "critical defense housing area" under subsection (l) shall not make such area ineligible for the location of additional defense plants, facilities, or installations, or as a source of additional military procurement of any sort.

"'(n) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, in order to compensate for increases in costs and prices which have occurred, the maximum rent in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection for any housing accommodation shall, upon sworn application, be increased to 120 percent of the following: The maximum rent for the housing accommodation (or a comparable housing accommodation) in effect on June 30, 1947, plus the amount of any increase allowed or allowable under this act for major capital improvements or for increases in living space, services, furniture, furnishings, or equipment, and minus any decrease required or requirable under this act for decreases in living space, services, furniture, furnishings, or equipment, or for substantial deterioration or failure to perform ordinary repair, replacement, or maintenance. Any increase in a maximum rent applied for under this subsection which is based upon the maximum rent in effect on June 30, 1947, for the particular housing accommodation and upon increases and decreases actually allowed under this act shall be effective upon the filing of the application. Nothing in this subsection shall require the reduction of any maximum rent, nor prevent such additional adjustment for increases in costs and prices as the President may deem appropriate.'

"SEC. 204. Section 205 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Any person who demands, accepts, receives, or retains any payment of rent in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under the provisions of this act, or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, shall be liable to the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, received, or retained (or shall be liable to the United States as hereinafter provided) for reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court, plus liquidated damages in the amounts of (1) $50, or (2) not more than three times the amount by which the payment or payments demanded, accepted, received, or retained exceed the maximum rent which could lawfully be demanded, accepted, received, or retained, as the court in its discretion may determine, whichever in either case may be the greater amount: *Provided,* That the amount of such liquidated damages shall be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation.

"'(b) Any person who unlawfully evicts a tenant shall be liable to the person so evicted (or shall be liable to the United States as hereinafter provided) for reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court, plus liquidated damages in the amounts of (1) 1 month's rent or $50, whichever is greater, or (2) not more than three times such monthly rent, or $150, whichever is greater: *Provided,* That the amount of such liquidated damages shall be the amount of 1 month's rent or $50, whichever is greater, if the defendant proves that the violation was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation.

"'(c) Suit to recover liquidated damages as provided in this section may be brought in any Federal court of competent jurisdiction regardless of the amount involved, or in any State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction, within 1 year after the date of violation: *Provided,* That if the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, received, or retained, or the person wrongfully evicted, either fails to institute an action under this section within 30 days from the date of the occurrence of the violation or is not entitled for any reason to bring the action, the United States may settle the claim arising out of the violation or within 1 year after the date of violation may institute such action. If such claim is settled or such action is instituted, the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, received, or retained, or the person wrongfully evicted, shall thereafter be barred from bringing an action for the same violation or violations. For the purpose of determining the amount of liquidated damages to be awarded to the plaintiff in an action brought under subsection (a) of this section, all violations alleged in an action under said subsection (a) which were committed by the defendant with respect to the plaintiff prior to the bringing of such an action shall be deemed to constitute one violation and, in such action under subsection (a) of this section, the amount demanded, accepted, received, or retained in connection with such one violation shall be deemed to be the aggregate amount demanded, accepted, received, or retained in connection with all such violations. A judgment for damages or on the merits in any action under either subsection (a) or (b) of this section shall be a bar to any recovery under the same subsection of this section in any other action against the same defendant on account of any violation with respect to the same person prior to the institution of the action in which such judgment was rendered.'

"SEC. 205. Section 206 (a) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) It shall be unlawful for any person to demand, accept, receive, or retain any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under this act, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of this act, or of any regulation or order or requirement under this act, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

"'(2) It shall be unlawful for any person to evict, remove, or exclude, or cause to be evicted, removed, or excluded, any tenant from any controlled housing accommodations in any manner or upon any grounds except as authorized or permitted by the provisions of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, and any person who lawfully gains possession from a tenant of any controlled housing accommodations, and thereafter fails fully to comply with such requirements or conditions as may have been imposed for such possession by the provisions of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, shall also be deemed to have unlawfully evicted such tenant and shall be liable to such tenant, or to the United States, as provided in this act.'

"SEC. 206. (a) The first sentence of section 202 (c) (1) (A), of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is amended by striking out the following: 'which is located in a city of less than 2,500,000 population according to the 1940 decennial census and.'

"(b) Section 202 (c) (1) (B) of such act is repealed.

"SEC. 207. Section 202 (d) of such act (defining defense-rental area) is amended by inserting after '204 (i) (1) or (2)' the following: ', 204 (k), or 204 (l).'

"SEC. 208. (a) The last sentence of section 4 (c) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word 'section' the following: 'for persons engaged in defense activities and.'

"(b) Section 4 (e) of such act is amended by striking out 'July 31, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1952.'

"(c) Section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) For the purposes of this section, any parent of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States who lost his life in the armed services of the United States since September 16, 1940, shall be considered to be a member of the family of a veteran of World War II.'

"SEC. 209. Section 215 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946 (59 Stat. 134), and section 213 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 81), are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 210. (a) Section 202 (a) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The term "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or legal successor or representative of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That no punishment provided by this act shall apply to the United States, or to any such government, political subdivision, or government agency.'

"(b) Section 204 (i) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(7) The President shall establish, for each housing accommodation in the suburban resettlement project known as Greenbelt, Md., a maximum rent equal to 120 per cent of the rent in effect on January 30, 1942, plus or minus such adjustments as are provided in subsection (b) (1) of this section with respect to maximum rents established under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.'

SEC. 211. Nothing in this act or in the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, shall be construed to require any person to offer any housing accommodations for rent."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. IVES conferees on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE TRIP TO EUROPE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning on returning to this country with my colleagues of the Foreign Relations Committee after a 2 weeks' trip abroad I issued a statement to the press briefly summarizing some of my own views and reactions, and I believe those of some of my associates.

We visited seven countries and received reports from six others. Personally I feel that the trip had a great deal of value, not only for the members of the committee, but also, I am sure, for the people whom we visited. They obtained a different idea of America, I believe. We visited France, England, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Italy, and Germany, and then returned to France.

Some time later I hope to present some of my obesrvations on visiting the various countries. At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the text of a statement which I released to the press this morning.

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

PRESS STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

My colleagues and I have just returned from a 2 weeks' visit to countries of Western Europe and the Near East. We made our trip in order to obtain first-hand information for the benefit of the American people and the members of the United States Senate who will, in a few days, begin consideration of the $8,500,000,000 mutual security program recommended by the President.

Our travel was very rewarding in that it enabled members of our subcommittee to understand and appreciate the point of view of those countries with whom we must work so closely together in the defense of freemen. I hope that other Members of the Congress will be able to travel to Europe to see the effects of American aid during the past few years and to sense, as I did, the deep appreciation of Europeans for the help we are giving them in their time of need.

One of the most encouraging things I sensed during our trip was the deep realization of the part of the people of Europe of the importance of the spiritual and moral elements in our struggle to defend the free world from totalitarian aggression. These people realize, perhaps more than do we, that communism cannot be defeated by force alone, but must be rejected in the minds of men.

In the nations we visited I found a strong determination to seek strength by collectively building up our defenses. In the building of strength, tremendous sacrifices are being made. It is hard for an American to comprehend the measure of austerity which now characterizes life in the United Kingdom. In Turkey such a large portion of the national budget goes into defense purposes that relatively little is left over for such things as roads, public health, and schools. In Greece, the people, though ravaged by war and occupation and subjected to internal subversion for a period of nearly 10 years, are firm in their determination to defend their freedom with force if that should prove necessary.

I do not want to leave the impression that all that needs to be done is being done. The western world is woefully weak. We cannot build our strength too fast. General Eisenhower and his staff are doing a magnificent job, but it is one in which we can find success only if each nation contributes according to its ability.

I am firmly convinced as a result of this visit to Europe that the European recovery program, approved by a great bipartisan majority of the Members of Congress, has been successful. In fact, I feel certain that several countries of Western Europe would have been overcome by subversive forces had we not given this aid.

In my visits with foreign officials and representatives of our Government abroad, I have sought to make crystal clear that there is a limit to the military and economic aid which the United States can give to the free world. The United States must, as is true of any other nation, think first of itself. That means that we cannot give aid to nations unwilling to help themselves in full measure. We cannot strain the resources and pocketbooks of the American taxpayers to a point where our solvency is in danger. I believe, however, that it is in the interest of the United States to help the free world, build as quickly as possible its defensive strength against the threat of Communist aggression.

I want to commend the members of the committee and particularly the very able chairman of our subcommittee, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, who has shown ability, endurance, and good will in the way in which he performed his duties as chairman of our committee during its travels.

THE KOREAN WAR—ADDRESS BY JAMES T. WYATT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point, as a part of my remarks, a radio address delivered by James T. Wyatt, of Station KOIN of Portland, Oreg., on July 10, 1951. The broadcast is a summarization of the Korean debacle from its inception to the date of the broadcast, and is a rare example of objectivity, clarity, and brevity. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

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

The once bold statements above liberating all Korea were no longer echoed today. The history of the Korean war is one of the strangest in American annals, and is worth a brief review.

In the first place, it was started without the consent of Congress, through the device of not calling it a war.

In its early stages, it came close to defeat for American forces, due to the defense department's complete failure to gage the real strength of the enemy.

General MacArthur was originally ordered to stop the North Koreans with air power alone. Then Washington ordered the landing of ground troops, a move which seemed popular at the time, since it was done in the name of the United Nations—and for the stated purpose of freeing and unifying all Korea.

But it was done in defiance of the much-quoted axiomatic warning that "anyone who orders American troops to fight on the Asiatic mainland ought to have his head examined."

Then followed the grim days of retreats to the hard-pressed Pusan beachhead. There was talk at the Pentagon that Korea might have to be abandoned. The State Department started to write off Formosa also, as revealed in its instructions to diplomatic agents to stress the untruth that Formosa was of no consequence.

In these dark days, MacArthur proposed that now-famous military master stroke, the Inchon Landing.

But the Pentagon refused to support MacArthur. The Washington generals could not stomach anything so daring to snatch victory from a losing war.

MacArthur's only champion was Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, who backed Inchon. But Johnson was fired 2 days before the famous landing, and the Pentagon told MacArthur he could expect no reinforcements if Inchon failed.

It was an amazing state of affairs, with few, if any, parallels in modern military history.

The general, on the eve of his most daring bid for victory, was standing alone with his troops. The State Department was in full retreat. Johnson was fired, and the Pentagon, expecting failure, was waiting for MacArthur's head.

These facts have come slowly and gradually to light as the history of this peculiar war is written.

All that the world knew at the time was the sudden electrifying news of Inchon. with one daring stroke, MacArthur had turned the tables on the enemy and seized victory from the ashes of slow retreat.

Inchon symbolized subsequent events. General MacArthur stood for daring and victory. The Pentagon was fearful and abandoned victory. The result was stalemate.

Faced with this impasse, some men in the general's position would have felt justified in resigning the command.

It is historically interesting that MacArthur faced even stalemate as a challenge. If all this bloodshed was to be in vain, there must be yet another solution. He came up with the bold offer to meet the enemy commander in the field and arrange an armistice.

Once again Washington refused to support him. The State Department concocted the myth that he had spoiled a peace plan of its own. This story was never supported at United Nations headquarters nor anywhere else. Nazrollah Entezam's peace committee was at the time awaiting offers from either side and getting none.

General MacArthur's offer to meet the enemy commander in the field was given as a reason for his subsequent dismissal.

Then followed the so-called Operation Killer as the Pentagon's alternative to either peace or victory. Operation Killer openly boasted of the thousands of Chinese that were slaughtered, and the thousands more that were still to be slaughtered.

This was a low ebb in the morals of a merciful Nation, and it did much harm to American prestige in Asia.

By this time, Washington was talking about "disaster that lay ahead." The anger of futility in Korea was fanning the flames of a still greater holocaust.

In Moscow's Kremlin, the Politburo saw the beckoning opportunity to seize the initiative. Russia would become the champion of peace in Korea by copying the pattern that General MacArthur had devised.

The formula was the same, but the propaganda value was different. In the first case it was MacArthur's initiative, saying in effect, "I will talk peace. Do you want war?" But now it is the Russian initiative, putting the same question in reverse.

The brave men who fought and died in Korea against a powerful enemy have turned in a record of military prowess. The diplomatic defeat is not their chagrin.

CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order previously entered, the next order of business is the call of the calendar. The Secretary will proceed with the call of the calendar.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 32) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile, was announced as first in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Educational Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that this bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 618) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that this bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 857) for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that this bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 36) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 719) to establish beyond doubt that under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This bill has been made a special order for the 2d day of August. It will be passed over.

The bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2929) to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. The companion bill, Senate bill 618, Calendar 132, has already been passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 133) discharging the Committee on the District of Columbia from the further consideration of S. 656, the home-rule bill for the District, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY MARSHALS

The bill (S. 35) to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I make a statement with reference to the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am glad to do so. I was not objecting on behalf of myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as this bill was reported from the Judiciary Committee, and as it has been reported adversely from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it would allow a United States marshal to appoint or remove deputies with the approval of the Attorney General, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations.

In this form, the bill is the same as S. 3993 of the Eighty-first Congress, which unanimously passed the Senate on August 23, 1950.

Deputy marshals have been in and out of civil service on different occasions. Without attempting to recount all changes, it may be noted that in 1908 deputy marshals were excepted, at least with regard to appointment, by the civil service rules. Later, however, they appear to have been brought within the scope of the law, as a result of administrative changes in the rules; and by 1910 deputy marshals were being appointed on the basis of competitive examination.

In 1913, Congress enacted a statute providing that deputy marshals required to give bond may be appointed without regard to the civil service laws; and thereafter, for a number of years, a deputy marshal was clearly subject to appointment and removal by the marshal solely at his discretion. As late as 1939 the Civil Service Commission regarded deputy marshals who might be required by law or by direction of the marshal to execute a bond as excepted by the statute from the provisions of the civil service laws. In 1940, the President was given broad authority to cover positions in the executive departments and agencies into the classified civil service. That statute in terms exempted the positions of assistant United States district attorney, but did not exempt United States deputy marshals. Subsequently, an executive order issued in April of 1941 provided among other things that all offices and positions in the executive civil service of the United States except those that were temporary and those that were specifically excepted from the provisions of section 1 of the 1940 act, and those excepted from the classified civil service under civil service rules, and those which then had a classified status, were thereby to be covered into the classified civil service of the Government. It will be noted that this executive order did not mention deputy marshals. However, deputy marshals were apparently regarded as within the classified civil service as a result of this order. The reasoning was that the act of 1940 gave the President the power to cover deputy marshals into the civil service, and to that extent operated to repeal the earlier 1913 statute.

When the judicial code was revised and reenacted in 1948, section 542 of title 28 was framed to read as follows:

The Attorney General may authorize any United States marshal to appoint deputies and clerical assistants. Deputy marshals shall be subject to removal by the marshal pursuant to civil service regulations.

The reviser's note to this provision points out that references to removal of deputy marshals by the Attorney General or the district courts had been omitted from the revised section as obsolete.

It is clear, therefore, that the inclusion of deputy marshals under the civil service was a matter of development, rather than a matter of specific and formal decision, either by the President or by the Congress; and Congress has never affirmatively directed that deputy marshals be under the civil service.

As a matter of fact, since Congress has specifically provided that assistant United States attorneys should not be under civil service, and since in many respects the position held by a deputy marshal, with respect to his marshal, is similar to the position held by an assistant United States attorney, with respect to the United States attorney, under whom he serves, the two officers should be treated alike.

The United States attorney is solely responsible for the conduct of his office, and therefore should be able to choose, without regard to civil service regulations, such assistants as he may deem fit and proper for the position. Similarly, the United States marshal is solely responsible for the conduct of his office, and should have similar rights with regard to selection of persons for whose conduct he must answer.

It was on this basis that the bill was approved by the Judiciary Committee.

Subsequently, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill was referred to that committee, under a unanimous consent agreement providing that it should be reported back to the Senate within a specified period of time. After the expiration of that period of time, the bill was reported back to the Senate from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee with an adverse report, which is Senate Report No. 313.

While the bill was under consideration by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee addressed a letter to the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, suggesting a possible compromise. It was the understanding of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that this suggestion met with favor by his colleague, but that it was not acted upon by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

This proposed compromise has been embodied in an amendment, which it will be my purpose to offer to the bill S. 35. The amendment would allow a United States marshal to appoint a deputy of his own choice provided the appointee is able to pass a suitable, noncompetitive examination, as prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. This would not take the deputy marshals out from under civil service, but at the same time it would not limit a marshal to employment of only those persons certified to him by the regional director of the Civil Service Commission.

This amendment would provide further that after the enactment of this act, a marshal might have 60 days within which to remove deputies, subject to the approval of the Attorney General; and a newly appointed marshal would have 60 days after his appointment within which to remove any deputies holding over from appointment by his predecessor.

After this initial 60-day period, in either case, a deputy marshal would be subject to removal only pursuant to civil service laws.

The amendment also contains a provision that when a deputy marshal has been appointed as marshal, and has served his term, he may upon application be restored to the position of deputy marshal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

SUBSTITUTION FOR DRAW-BACK PURPOSES—AMENDMENT OF SECTION 313 (B) OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930

The bill (H. R. 2192) to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask the Senator from New Jersey to withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold my objection.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the Senator making an unalterable objection at this time?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am objecting on behalf of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who, I understand, has an amendment which he desires to have considered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I had intended to propose the amendment on behalf of the Senator from Michigan, if I were permitted to do so. If the Senator from New Jersey will withdraw his objection, I shall be glad to offer the amendment.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withhold my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey withhold his objection, or does he withdraw it?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withdraw it.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "For", to strike out "Draw-Back" and insert "Drawback"; in line 6, after the word "duty-paid", to strike out "sugar;" and insert "sugar, or"; in line 7, after the word "nonferrous", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "metal;" and insert "metal, or"; in the same line, after the word "nonferrous", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "metal; flaxseed and linseed, and flaxseed and" and insert "metal, or flaxseed or linseed, or flaxseed or"; on page 2, line 6, after the words "amount of", to strike out "draw-back" and insert "drawback"; at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "sugar;" and insert "sugar, or"; in the same line, after the word "nonferrous", to strike out "metal;" and insert "metal, or"; in line 9, after the word "nonferrous", to strike out "metal; flaxseed and linseed, and flaxseed and" and insert "metal, or flaxseed or linseed or flaxseed or"; in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "draw-back" and insert "drawback"; and line 13, after the word "of", to strike out "draw-back" and insert "drawback"; and in line 14, after the word "imported", to strike out "merchandise," and insert "merchandise".

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is unavoidably absent today, I offer an amendment to the pending bill.

I move that the word "nonferrous" be stricken out in lines 6 and 7 of page 1 and in lines 8 and 9 of page 2.

The purpose of the amendment is to extend to ferrous metal, and ore containing ferrous metal, the privilege of substitution for drawback purposes. This privilege has been extended for more than 20 years to nonferrous metals, and ore containing nonferrous metals, as well as to sugar. House bill 2192 would extend it further to flaxseed, linseed, flaxseed oil, and linseed oil.

I merely wish to add that I believe the amendment has prima facie merit. It is my suggestion that the Senate adopt the amendment and send it to conference. I am advised by the chairman of the Committee on Finance that it is agreeable to him that such course be followed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is my understanding correct that this is the amendment which the Senator from Michigan contemplated offering?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL RECOMMITTED TO COMMITTEE

The bill (S. 621) to amend section 604 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949 was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, so that the administrative differences may be worked out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill is recommitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN FORMER CITIZENS

The bill (H. R. 400) to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in behalf of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. I withhold my objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is unfortunate that objection should be made whenever this bill is called on the calendar. It would enable persons who lost their United States citizenship by reason of voting in political elections held in Italy on June 2, 1946, or on April 18, 1948, to regain their United States citizenship.

Immediately following the cessation of hostilities in World War II a great many United States citizens, both native-born and naturalized, of Italian ancestry, returned to Italy on visits and business. A number of United States citizens had been in Italy throughout the war years. With the first free elections in Italy in almost 25 years an intensive campaign to get out the vote was started. The Italian Government imposed legal pressures, and moral pressure was imposed by friends and neighbors, to make it clear that nonvoters would be classified as civic slackers. Communist Party supporters used threats and coercion to force Italians to vote in the hope of gaining votes for Communist Party candidates. One of the strongest pressures emanated from the United States columnists and radio commentators, who set in motion a letter-writing campaign by Americans who had relatives in Italy. It is estimated that a million letters were sent from this country to friends and relatives in Italy, urging them to vote.

In the great majority of cases those American citizens who voted were unaware of the fact that such voting would result in the loss of their United States citizenship. The best estimate is that between three and four thousand individuals have lost their United States citizenship by voting in the Italian elections.

The committee has added a proviso to the bill which requires that individuals benefited by this bill take an oath that they have done nothing to promote the cause of communism.

Mr. President, the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who has made objection to the bill all along, cannot be placed in the category of those who are objecting to it generally. The bill is being objected to by every Communist in America today, because the Communists want to punish those who went to Italy or were in Italy, and who voted to keep the Communist Party down in Italy. Hence they propose to keep those people from ever again regaining United States citizenship. It is unfortunate that any Senator or any Member of Congress should lend himself to that movement, which is broadcast in the country today.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the joint resolution will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1590) for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2119) to amend sections 544 and 546 of title 28, United States Code, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina objects, and the bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1390) to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Whoever", to strike out "as" and insert "being"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "attended", to insert "by request of either House or committee thereof"; in line 18, after the word "considered", to strike out "prima facie evidence" and insert "a rebuttable presumption", and on page 3, line 6, after the word "witness", to insert "by request of either House or committee thereof", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1505 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting "(a)" before "Whoever" at the beginning thereof and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Whoever being an officer of the United States or of any department or agency thereof causes or attempts to cause a witness, who is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States or an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, to be demoted, dismissed, retired, or otherwise disciplined on account of his attending or having attended, by request of either House or committee thereof, any inquiry or investigation being had by either House, or any committee of either House, or any joint committee of the Congress, or on account of his testifying or having testified to any matter pending therein, or on account of his testimony on any matter pending therein, unless such testimony discloses misfeasance, malfeasance, dereliction of duty, or past reprehensible conduct on the part of such witness, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"The demotion, dismissal, or retirement (other than voluntary or for physical disability) of such witness within 1 year after so attending or testifying in such inquiry or investigation, unless such testimony discloses misfeasance, malfeasance, dereliction of duty, or past reprehensible conduct on the part of such witness, shall be considered a rebuttable presumption that such witness was demoted, dismissed, or retired because of such attendance or such testimony."

SEC. 2. Section 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting "(a)" before "No" at the beginning thereof and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) No witness, who is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States or an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, shall be demoted, dismissed, retired, or otherwise disciplined on account of testimony given or official papers or records produced by such witness, by request of either House or committee thereof, before either House, or before any committee of either House, or before any joint committee established by a joint or concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, unless such testimony is given or such official papers or records are produced in violation of law, or unless such testimony or the production of such papers or records disclose misfeasance, malfeasance, dereliction of duty, or reprehensible conduct on the part of such witness."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF FOOD SERVICES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The bill (S. 1349) to establish a Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—I should like to have an explanation of the bill, for the purpose of the RECORD. I think it is a very important bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this bill would centralize the handling of cafeterias and school-lunch problems in the District of Columbia. The present school cafeterias in Washington are operated by the principals of each school as private nonprofit enterprises. The bill would establish a

central office for food services, with power to engage in wholesale purchasing, to establish uniform dietary and other standards, and to administer school-lunch and surplus-food-disposal programs in cooperation with officials of the Federal Government. The bill authorizes the establishment of a revolving fund of $25,000, and it is contemplated that the program will continue to be non-profit-making and self-sustaining.

The bill has been requested and approved by the Board of Commissioners and the Board of Education. It was unanimously reported by the full Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How much is proposed to be appropriated to carry out this testing of breath and blood and urine?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from North Dakota is referring to another bill.

Mr. LANGER. How much does this bill appropriate per year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It authorizes $25,000 as a revolving fund, which we hope will be sufficient for all time in the future.

Mr. LANGER. In the District of Columbia only?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This bill relates only to the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with the bill, certain correspondence which is further explanatory thereof.

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

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1951.

The Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPEL: It is observed that when the calendar was called in the Senate on June 21 you objected to consideration of the bill S. 1349, entitled "A bill to establish a Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes." It is understood the objection was made for the purpose of permitting further study of the legislation by the minority committee on the calendar, of which you are a member.

In order that you may be advised of the objectives of this legislation I am enclosing five copies of a letter dated June 28, 1951, addressed to me by the Superintendent of Schools for the District of Columbia which gives a general statement of the present food service situation in the public schools, the benefits to be derived from establishment of a food service department, and the method of financing the operation of such a department.

I shall be very happy to furnish any further information which you or the committee desires in respect to this matter.

Very sincerely yours,
VERNON E. WEST,
Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia.

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1951.

Mr. VERNON E. WEST,
Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia,
District Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEST: In response to Mr. Bryan's request I am submitting this letter answering the three points which he brought up, namely, the present food service situation, the benefits to be derived from a food service department, and the method of financing the food service department.

PRESENT FOOD SERVICE SITUATION

The cafeterias of the school system are now operated as individual units in each school. This requires each principal to operate an individual business with the resultant problems in buying, in employment, and in accounting. In each case it is necessary that the principal not only operate a business but that he have sufficient profits to replace and repair the equipment in his cafeteria. This, of course, has made it necessary to keep the price of food high in some cases. Food purchases for cafeterias, while being bought from wholesale houses, have not been bought in sufficiently large quantities by each school to permit much reduction in cost. The Superintendent directed a study of the entire cafeteria organization and considered the following problems:

1. Authority and responsibility of the Board of Education for operating school cafeterias.
2. Centralized management.
3. Centralized purchasing.
4. Standardization for prices and servings at the lowest possible cost level.
5. Uniform accounting and auditing practices.
6. Installation, maintenance, replacement, and extension of equipment.
7. Complete insurance coverage.
8. Status and protection of cafeteria employees.
9. Uniform employment practices (including standardization of wages and hours and classification of jobs), qualifications, and duties.
10. Method of financing.

Over and above these specific problems is the responsibility of the schools for providing proper food service to the pupils with proper attention to dietetics, nutrition, and other related health habits. Because of the fact that feeding is such an integral part of the whole educational program, the means by which it is accomplished should be the best possible.

The superintendent is convinced, as a result of his investigation and continued study of this question, that the school cafeterias should be operated by the board of education through the establishment of a cafeteria department responsible to the superintendent of schools. This conviction of the superintendent is shared by the members of his staff and by the officers in the field in whose buildings cafeterias are being operated.

BENEFITS TO BE DERIVED FROM A FOOD-SERVICE DEPARTMENT

The superintendent and his associates are further convinced that the following improvements in the cafeteria situation would result with the board of education in full control of cafeteria operation:

1. All cafeterias would be operated by the board as an integral part of the school system.
2. The cafeteria department would be staffed by a competent director and assistants responsible to the Superintendent of Schools.
3. The principals would be relieved of the pressing responsibilities of cafeteria business management.
4. The principals would continue to be responsible for the educational aspects of the cafeteria as an important school laboratory.
5. All personnel management, including employment and assignment, would be the responsibility of the cafeteria director through such channels as would be designated by the Superintendent.
6. All cafeteria workers would be employees of the Board of Education and as such would be paid according to rates to be determined by the Board with rights of leave, retirement, and security enjoyed by other employees of the Board.
7. All purchasing would be centralized.
8. All accounting procedures would be standardized and uniform.
9. All funds and accounts would be audited and periodic reports submitted to the Board of Education.
10. The services to all children in all schools would be uniform and of a high standard.
11. Prices to all children would be uniform and would be computed on a nonprofit basis.
12. Considerable freedom of choice in menus would be exercised by the local school cafeteria manager within the framework of recognized standards in dietetics.

Legislation is required to establish the necessary department with central staff and equipment and to authorize annual appropriations to cover over-all costs of central management, including salaries, accounting, and the necessary storage and delivery services; and to establish an over-all trust fund into which the revenues of the cafeterias could be deposited and from which purchases could be made.

METHOD OF FINANCING THE FOOD SERVICE DEPARTMENT

The bill, S. 1349, carries a provision for establishing a "District of Columbia public schools food services fund" and authorizes the appropriation of $25,000 out of District of Columbia revenue to be credited to this fund. This is necessary in order to give an operating base in the initiation of this program. To this will be added all the revenues and receipts derived from the operation of the cafeterias in the various schools. All costs related to the operation of the food services in the schools will be taken from this fund. This will include the purchase of food, supplies, personal services, including the expenses of conducting the office of central management. The food service department will in this way be self-sustaining. The only exception to this is that the acquisition, maintenance, and replacement of equipment will be from appropriated funds as are all other such items in the public school plants.

I am also enclosing other reports submitted to the Board of Education at various times which cover all of these points.

Very sincerely yours,
HOBART M. CORNING,
Superintendent of Schools.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 951, would the Senator from North Dakota agree to put this bill at the foot of the calendar? I think he is thinking of a different bill, and perhaps we can get together.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection to having the bill placed at the foot of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 997) for the relief of William J. Drinkwine, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, what action was taken on Senate bill 951, Calendar No. 417?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It went to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina was speaking of Calendar No. 401, Senate bill 1349, relating to a department of food services for the schools of the District of Columbia. However, the Senator from North Dakota was objecting to the consideration of Calendar No. 417, Senate bill 951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was some confusion in connection with the bill.

The Senator from South Carolina was explaining Senate bill 1349, Calendar 401, and it seemed to the Chair that the Senator from North Dakota was objecting to the consideration of that bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, Calendar 417, Senate bill 951, was not called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That bill goes to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No, Mr. President; I asked that calendar 401, Senate bill 1349, be placed at the foot of the calendar. It was that bill to which the Senator from North Dakota objected.

Mr. LANGER. No, Mr. President; I had no objection to calendar 401, Senate bill 1349. I withdraw any objection to that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of calendar No. 401, Senate bill 1349?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1349) to establish a department of food services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments on page 2, line 22, after the numerals "1949", to insert a colon and the following provisos: "*Provided*, That the salaries of persons employed to manage cafeterias, lunchrooms, and related services shall be paid in installments and computed in accordance with the provisions of the fourth and fifth paragraphs under the subheading 'For allowance to principals' under the caption 'Public schools,' contained in the act of Congress entitled 'An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes,' approved May 26, 1908 (35 Stat. 290, 291), as amended (sec. 31-609, D. C. Code, 1940 ed.): *And provided further*, That such persons shall not be entitled to leave with pay of any kind except that which is allowed teachers under the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949."

On page 5, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 3. Service rendered by any person for salary or wages as an employee of any cafeteria or lunchroom operated in the public school buildings of the District during any period prior to the date when such cafeteria or lunchroom is placed under the office of central management shall, if and when such person becomes an employee of the Department of Food Services, be deemed to be service rendered for the government of the District of Columbia for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, to be computed in accordance with section 5 of such act: *Provided*, That such person shall make deposits covering such service as provided in section 9 of such act: *And provided further*, That any such person may elect to make such deposits in installments in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of such act.

In line 20, to change the section number from "3" to "4"; on page 6, line 13, to change the section number from "4" to "5"; on page 17, line 13, to change the section number from "5" to "6"; on page 8, line 16, to change the section number from "7" to "8"; in line 23, to change the section number from "8" to "9", and on page 9, line 3, to change the section number from "9" to "10", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—PUBLIC SCHOOL CAFETERIAS AND LUNCHROOMS

SECTION 1. That there is hereby created in the public schools of the District of Columbia a Department of Food Services, which Department, under the direction and control of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, hereinafter referred to as the "Board", is hereby authorized to conduct a centralized system of public school cafeterias, lunchrooms, and related services, hereinafter referred to as "food services".

SEC. 2. For carrying out the purposes of this act, the Board is empowered—

(a) to establish in the Department of Food Services an Office of Central Management consisting of a Director and Assistant Directors of Food Services, whose compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 as amended;

(b) to make and enforce such rules and regulations as it deems necessary for the government of the Department of Food Services and for the use and enjoyment of the facilities and services of such department;

(c) upon the written recommendations of the superintendent of schools, to employ such personnel as may be required to manage cafeterias, lunchrooms, and related services and to conduct the Office of Central Management. The compensation of such personnel, other than the Director and Assistant Directors of Food Services, shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949: *Provided*, That the salaries of persons employed to manage cafeterias, lunchrooms, and related services shall be paid in installments and computed in accordance with the provisions of the fourth and fifth paragraphs under the subheading "For allowance to principals" under the caption "Public schools" contained in the act of Congress entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes," approved May 26, 1908 (35 Stat. 290, 291), as amended (sec. 31-609 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.): *And provided further*, That such persons shall not be entitled to leave with pay of any kind except that which is allowed teachers under the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949;

(d) upon the written recommendation of the superintendent of schools, to employ on a full-time or part-time basis such personnel as may be required for the operation and maintenance of food services at rates of pay to be fixed by said Board without reference to the Classification Act of 1949, and with respect to part-time employees without regard to prohibitions or limitations relating to dual compensation as contained in any act of Congress. Persons employed under the provisions of this paragraph shall be entitled to compensation for all time when and as they perform service, and, in addition thereto, shall be entitled to compensation for such holidays as fall within a regular tour of duty of not less than 5 days in any established workweek. Persons employed under this paragraph shall not be entitled, by reason of such service, to vacation or annual leave with pay. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, such persons shall be entitled to sick leave with pay, to be cumulative at the rate of 1 day a month, September to June, inclusive, of each year, the total cumulation not to exceed 30 days, to be granted under such conditions as the Board may by regulation prescribe: *Provided*, That as to part-time employees such leave shall be pro rated on an hourly basis. The days of sick leave with pay provided for in this section shall mean days on which employees would otherwise work and receive pay and shall be exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, holidays, and vacation periods authorized by the Board;

(e) upon the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, to accept for the benefit of the program of food services gifts of money which shall be deposited in the fund created by section 4 of this act, and of personal property and volunteer personal service.

SEC. 3. Service rendered by any person for salary or wages as an employee of any cafeteria or lunchroom operated in the public-school buildings of the District during any period prior to the date when such cafeteria or lunchroom is placed under the office of central management shall, if and when such person becomes an employee of the Department of Food Services, be deemed to be service rendered for the government of the District of Columbia for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, to be computed in accordance with section 5 of such act: *Provided*, That such person shall make deposits covering such service as provided in section 9 of such act: *And provided further*, That any such person may elect to make such deposits in installments in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of such act.

SEC. 4. Article II of title I of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the following new salary schedules immediately after the salary schedule for Class 34—Child Labor Inspectors:

"DEPARTMENT OF FOOD SERVICES

"CLASS 35—DIRECTOR OF DEPARTMENT OF FOOD SERVICES

"A basic salary of $6,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $200 for 5 years, or a maximum salary of $7,000 per year is reached.

"CLASS 36—ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF DEPARTMENT OF FOOD SERVICES

"A basic salary of $5,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $200 for 5 years, or until a maximum salary of $6,000 per year is reached."

SEC. 5. There is hereby created in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as "District of Columbia Public School Food Services Fund," hereinafter referred to as the "Food Services Fund," and there is authorized to be appropriated, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, $25,000 which shall be credited to the Food Services Fund. All revenues and receipts of any nature whatever derived from the operation of food services, or as provided otherwise by this act, shall, under regulations of the Board, be paid over to the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia not less often than once each week and by him deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Food Services Fund. Such fund shall be used as a permanent revolving fund and expenditures therefrom

shall be made only upon vouchers certified by the Superintendent of Schools or his designated agent and approved before payment by the Auditor of the District of Columbia, and shall be disbursed in the same manner as other District of Columbia funds are disbursed. The Food Services Fund shall be available for the purchase of food, supplies, and all other services and expenditures of whatever nature which are necessary for the conduct of the Department of Food Services, including personal services, the operation and maintenance of motor trucks, and the expenses of conducting the Office of Central Management.

SEC. 6. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the acquisition, maintenance, and replacement of equipment used or acquired for use in the conduct of the Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. (a) All funds, whether in cash or other form, in the custody or possession of the person or persons operating cafeterias and lunchrooms in public school buildings of the District of Columbia which funds have been derived from such operations shall, on the date such cafeterias and lunchrooms are placed under the Office of Central Management, be paid to the Collector of Taxes, District of Columbia, and deposited by him in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Food Services Fund, and all supplies and equipment of whatever nature acquired for use in such cafeterias and lunchrooms shall, by the person or persons having custody or possession of such supplies and equipment, be returned or transferred to the Board of Education, together with all books and records pertaining to the same: *Provided*, That the Board of Education shall place all such cafeterias and lunchrooms under the Office of Central Management not more than 1 year after the Department of Food Services is established by said Board.

(b) All obligations incurred for food, supplies, and equipment used or usable in the conduct of cafeterias and lunchrooms unsatisfied on the day the respective cafeterias and lunchrooms are placed under the Office of Central Management, shall be paid from the Food Services Fund.

SEC. 8. Insofar as the Board shall conduct a school-lunch program under the authority of this title, it shall be considered a "school" within the meaning of the National School Lunch Act, and all funds to which it may thus become entitled as a participating school under the National School Lunch Act shall be deposited in the fund created by section 4 hereof.

SEC. 9. It shall be the duty of the Auditor of the District of Columbia to audit at least quarterly the accounts of the Department of Food Services and make reports thereof to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 10. This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act."

TITLE II—DISTRIBUTION OF COMMODITIES

SEC. 201. The Board of Education of the District of Columbia is authorized (a) to enter into a contract or contracts from time to time with the United States Department of Agriculture for the distribution to schools and to public and charitable institutions of commodities made available by said Department, and (b) to carry out, under regulations of the said Board, a program or programs of furnishing milk to school children in the District, including the purchase and distribution of milk under agreement with the United States Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That all moneys collected under such program or programs shall be paid to the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia for deposit into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District.

SEC. 202. Appropriations are hereby authorized to enable the Board of Education to carry out the contracts and programs authorized by this title.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 951) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

WILLIAM J. DRINKWINE

The bill (H. R. 997) for the relief of William J. Drinkwine was announced as next in order.

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

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$2,100" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,002.50."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may the amendment be read again, please? We could not hear it as it was read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be restated.

The amendment was again stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I now send to the desk an explanation of the amendment, and I should like to have the explanation incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

The purpose of the amendment is to deduct the amount of wages claimant earned during the period of his suspension from his position with the Post Office Department, in order to be in conformity with the policy expressed in existing law in that regard. Thus, the act of June 10, 1948, which allows compensation (prospectively from that date) for periods of unjust suspension, provides for deductions of any money earned from outside employment during such period.

PAUL MATELLI

The bill (H. R. 1443) for the relief of Paul Matelli was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PEERLESS CASUALTY CO. ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 3217) for the relief of the Peerless Casualty Co. and of Charles E. Nelson and Irwin I. Main was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LOU WONG SHONG NGON

The bill (S. 1028) for the relief of Mrs. Lou Wong Shong Ngon was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Lou Wong Shong Ngon, a former resident of the United States and the mother of five United States citizen children, shall be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa under section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, provided she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1414) for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

HARVEY MARDEN

The bill (S. 1562) for the relief of Harvey Marden was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in full satisfaction of the claim of Harvey Marden, of Mescalero, N. Mex., against the United States for the loss of his hand and forearm suffered by him at the age of nine, in the United States Government laundry at the Mescalero Indian School in 1932, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum of a total of $5,000, $1,000 to Harvey Marden and the remainder of $4,000 to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to be expended on behalf of Harvey Marden in such manner as in the judgment of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, or his designee, will best assist in the physical and economic rehabilitation of Harvey Marden: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

KAY ADEL SNEDEKER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 367) for the relief of Kay Adel Snedeker which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Kay Adel Snedeker, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Charles W. Snedeker and his wife, Amelia Mary Snedeker, citizens of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire what the substitute or amendment provides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us find out. I should like to have the amendment explained.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill waives the racial-exclusion provisions of the immigration law in behalf of a half Japanese and half American child residing in Japan. She is 4 years of age, and is residing with American citizens who desire to adopt her and bring her to the United States. The child would be considered to be a nonquota immigrant, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of citizens of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no ojection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ASSISTANCE TO FEDERAL PRISONERS IN THEIR REHABILITATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1365) to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "rehabilitation", to strike out "Such advances may be made only to prisoners released prior to the expiration of their maximum terms", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, acting for himself or through such officers and employees as he may designate, is authorized to use so much of the trust funds designated as "Commissary funds, Federal prisons" (31 U. S. C. 725s (22)), as may be surplus to other needs of the trust to provide advances to Federal prisoners as an aid to their rehabilitation.

SEC. 2. An advance made hereunder shall in no instance exceed $150 except with the specific approval of the Attorney General, and shall in every case be secured by the personal note of the prisoner conditioned to make repayment monthly when employed, or otherwise possessed of funds, with interest at a rate not to exceed 6 percent per annum and subject to an agreement on the part of the prisoner that the funds so advanced shall be expended only for the purposes designated in the loan agreement. Repayments of principal and interest shall be credited to the trust fund from which the advance was made. Any unpaid principal or interest on said note shall be considered as a debt due the United States.

SEC. 3. The Attorney General is authorized in his discretion to accept gifts or bequests of money for credit to the said trust fund which gifts or bequests, for the purpose of Federal income, State, and gift taxes, shall be deemed to be gifts or bequests to or for the use of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ANN LAMPLUGH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 880) for the relief of Ann Lamplugh which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$25,000", and insert "$10,000", and in line 10, after the word "Korea", to insert "*Provided*, That not part of the amount provided for in this act shall be subject to any claim for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund which may have paid any amount to the claimant herein by reason of the death of Elmer L. Lamplugh:", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ann Lamplugh, of New York City, N. Y., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of her husband, Elmer L. Lamplugh, who was killed when struck by a United States Air Force truck, on September 23, 1949, at Kimpo Airport, Korea: *Provided*, That no part of the amount provided for in this act shall be subject to any claim for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund which may have paid any amount to the claimant herein by reason of the death of Elmer L. Lamplugh: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

SONJA LOHMANN AND HER MINOR SON

The bill (H. R. 598) for the relief of Sonja Lohmann and her minor son was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ACT INCORPORATING NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The bill (H. R. 1899) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE H. WHIKE CONSTRUCTION CO.

The bill (H. R. 3002) for the relief of George H. Whike Construction Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. GOLDIE WEINER

The bill (H. R. 3708) for the relief of Mrs. Goldie Weiner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. D. WOODS

The bill (H. R. 4165) for the relief of A. D. Woods was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF VESSELS DOCUMENTED UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The bill (S. 1704) to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign countries, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—the Senator from New Jersey would appreciate it very much if the Senator from Washington would explain this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to explain the bill. It is not so technical as might appear from a reading of it. It merely provides that, as to any ship documented under the American flag, before it can be transferred to a foreign flag, the transfer must have the approval of the Secretary of Defense and the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, and there must be an open hearing. Furthermore, it must have the unanimous approval of members of the Maritime Board.

The objective of the bill is to remedy what we have for a very long time considered to be an evil, the transference of American ships to foreign registry, particularly to the Panamanian registry, which not only takes on the form of tax evasion, but which also depletes the American merchant marine.

The principal reason for the beginning of these transfers was that we could not arm some of our ships. Some of the tankers which were plying certain troubled waters throughout the world decided to take a transfer to the Panamanian flag in order that they might be armed. It turned out, perhaps, to be justifiable at the time, but it now constitutes a very great evil. The Panamanian merchant marine today is the fourth largest in the world, being exceeded only by the merchant marine of the United States, of Great Britain, and of Scandinavia.

Tax evasion is rampant. For example, the Standard Oil Co. has what it calls a Panamanian Oil Co., which operates many ships under the Panamanian flag. It has piled up a profit in Panama, and it brings the money into the United States whenever the time is best for it, that is to say, whenever it is to its advantage in the existing tax situation. Many other owners of American ships have been guilty of the same practices. When the ships are operated under other flags we have no control over the crews. In many cases the ships never see Panama. In some instances it may be years before the crews of the ships know where Panama is. The ships are registered for a small fee, through a Panamanian consul in New York. Crews come from Europe, Italy, France, and the Orient.

In my opinion, the time has come when we should strike at this evil, and try to put an end to it. Of course, the bill

now under consideration would enable us to reach only Americans involved in these transactions, unless universal approval were given by other countries. We must still reach American citizens who build ships in foreign shipyards with American capital, thereafter sending them to Panama, Liberia, or Honduras, to ply the seven seas under the flags of those nations. A part of the trouble in connection with shipments to Red China has been attributable to Panamanian registry, over which the United Nations had no control.

I hope the Senator from New Jersey will favor the passage of this bill, because it will at least give us some control of the evil, and will, I am sure, go a long way toward eradicating it in the future.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third paragraph of section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Except as provided in section 611 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, it shall be unlawful (a) without prior approval of the Secretary of Commerce, to lease, bareboat charter, or time charter for a period of more than 1 year, or agree to lease, bareboat charter, or time charter for a period of more than 1 year, or in any manner transfer to any person not a citizen of the United States, any vessel or any interest therein owned in whole or in part by a citizen of the United States and documented under the laws of the United States, or the last documentation of which was under the laws of the United States; or (b) without prior approval of the Secretary of Commerce as provided in this paragraph, to sell or mortgage, or agree to sell or mortgage, to any person not a citizen of the United States, or transfer or place under foreign registry or flag, any vessel or any interest therein owned in whole or in part by a citizen of the United States and documented under the laws of the United States, or the last documentation of which was under the laws of the United States. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to approve such a sale, mortgage, or transfer of such a vessel if (1) the Secretary of Defense certifies that retention of the vessel is not of essential military or defense value to the United States; and (2) the Secretary of State certifies the sale, mortgage, or transfer of such vessel will be in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States; and (3) after a public hearing, the Federal Maritime Board determines that (A) such vessel is not necessary to the promotion and maintenance of an adequate merchant marine; and (B) such vessel is not to be operated in competition with American-flag ships in the foreign commerce of the United States; and (C) the maritime laws and the enforcement thereof governing manning scales, crew accommodations, and the safety of life and property at sea of the country and flag to which it is sought to transfer such vessel are in accordance with the highest international standards then prevailing."

SEC. 2. Section 501 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of the section and adding the following: "and (5) the applicant, or any holding company, subsidiary, or affiliate of such applicant, does not own, in whole or in part, or operate any foreign-flag vessel which competes with any American-flag service determined by the Federal Maritime Board to be essential under section 211 of this act, unless the Federal Maritime Board, by the unanimous vote of its members, determines that special circumstances warrant the waiving of this requirement."

SEC. 3. Section 804 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended by striking out the proviso thereof the phrase "by affirmative vote of four of its members," and substituting in lieu the following: "by the unanimous vote of its members."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with the bill just passed an article entitled "Magnuson Pushes Bill To Check Ship Transfers," published in the Washington Daily News of June 26, 1951.

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

DOESN'T HELP PRESENT SITUATION—MAGNUSON PUSHES BILL TO CHECK SHIP TRANSFERS

Senators WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, and HERBERT O'CONOR, Democrat, of Maryland, are sponsoring a bill to restrict the placing of United States Government-owned merchant ships under foreign flags.

After World War II nearly 1,000 Government surplus vessels were sold to American or foreign financial interests for registration under other flags. Some of these ships are now engaged in trade with Soviet countries.

The largest chunk of the tonnage which went under foreign registry now flies the flag of Panama.

NO HELP NOW

The Magnuson-O'Conor bill would be of no help in the case of Government-built ships which have already been put under foreign flags, but it would plug up the loopholes for ships under the United States flag on which the Government still holds a mortgage.

Essentially, the bill would erect these safeguards:

No merchant ship in which the United States Government has an interest could be transferred to foreign registry without a public hearing.

Unanimous approval of the Federal Maritime Board would be required for a transfer. In the past many ships have been transferred by a split decision.

HE'D HAVE VOICE

Certification by the Defense Secretary that transfer of a ship to foreign registry would not adversely affect United States security.

The Commerce Secretary would have to certify that there was no prospect of employing the vessel in question under the United States flag.

Senator MAGNUSON said he thought the recent public concern over foreign-flag ships which are carrying on trade with Red China would help in getting the bill through Congress.

SALE OF LAND ON THE BLACKFEET RESERVATION, MONT.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 629) to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 10, after the word "bonds", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That when the land is offered for sale the Blackfeet Tribe or any Indian who is a member of said tribe shall have 90 days within which to execute a preferential right to purchase said tract at the price offered by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase: *Provided further*, That if the land is purchased by the Blackfeet Tribe or a member thereof title shall be conveyed by deed to the United States in trust for the purchaser, and if the land is purchased by a non-Indian a patent in fee shall be issued to the purchaser."

And on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Blackfeet Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Blackfeet Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and such notice, together with a description of the lands, and an offer by the owner thereof to sell such lands upon the terms specified in such notice to the Blackfeet Tribe or any member thereof, shall have been posted for such period of time in a conspicuous public place at such agency, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Blackfeet Tribe or any member thereof and reported to the Superintendent of the Blackfeet Agency.

(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Blackfeet Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was given and posted in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection shall, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated, be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section.

(c) That, if the land is purchased by the Blackfeet Tribe or a member thereof, title shall be conveyed by deed to the United States in trust for the purchaser, and if the land is purchased by a non-Indian a patent in fee shall be issued to the purchaser.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LIBERALIZATION OF SERVICE PENSION LAWS RELATING TO CERTAIN VETERANS

The bill (H. R. 315) to liberalize the service pensions laws relating to veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the Boxer Rebellion, and their dependents was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, it appears to the junior Senator from New Jersey that this bill is going to be a rather costly one. I think, therefore, the RECORD should disclose an explanation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, today there are 15 rates of pension—non-service-connected disability—applying to veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion. This bill would establish, in lieu of those rates, four standard rates—$60, $78, $90, and $120. The latter rate applies only to those needing aid and attendance. The rates in existence and proposed rates are set forth in the report.

In each of these categories—70-day and 90-day service—almost 99 percent of the veterans of these wars on the rolls are now drawing pension at the rates sought to be provided for the entire group. There were only 997 veterans—December 31, 1950—who were drawing less than the $90 or $60 rate sought to be provided in the legislation. The Veterans' Administration estimates there will be approximately 850 in this category during fiscal 1952. Approximately 200 dependents of veterans of this war now on the rolls could receive increases under this bill.

The average age of the Spanish-American War veteran as of June 30, 1950, is estimated at 73.8 years and the death rate is approximately 9,000 per year. Veterans as they become age 65 are today entitled to the $90 rate or to the $60 rate, as appropriate for their service.

The committee believes the first-year cost will total approximately $326,000—$254,000 attributable to this increase for veterans, and $72,000 for dependents of deceased veterans. This should be the peak cost due to the advanced age and high death rate of over 9,000 per year.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for the explanation.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 315) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RENEWAL OF EXPIRING 5-YEAR LEVEL-PREMIUM-TERM INSURANCE FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

The bill (H. R. 1072) to amend the existing law to provide the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies of United States Government life insurance was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENSIONS FOR AID AND ATTENDANCE

The bill (H. R. 3193) to establish a rate of pension for aid and attendance under part III of Veterans Regulation numbered 1 (a), as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, this is a bill having to do with establishing a rate of pension for aid and attendance under part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended. The bill seeks to provide a pension of $120 a month for veterans of World Wars I and II and of the present conflict in those cases where an otherwise eligible veteran needs the regular aid and attendance of another person. It would also apply to a small number of the Spanish-American War veterans. The disability is of a non-service-connected type. Persons serving on and after June 27, 1950, and until such time as determined by the President or the Congress are covered by this proposal by virtue of Public Law 28 of the Eighty-second Congress.

The rate of pension provided for is in line with the $120 rate provided under the service pension laws now enjoyed by veterans of the Spanish-American War who have the same condition. There is a difference in eligibility requirements, however; such veterans do not have any income limitations with which to comply, while veterans covered by this bill cannot have more than $1,000 annual income if single, or $2,500 if with dependents, in order to get the benefits of this proposal.

The committee was of opinion that the veterans covered by the bill are by far the most meritorious of the non-service-connected-disability class. All of these men are either helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need the regular assistance of another person. It is estimated that during the first year approximately 400 World War II veterans, 23,700 veterans of World War I, and 50 veterans of the Spanish-American War would be eligible for benefits under the bill at an additional cost for that year of approximately $16,700,000.

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

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

REMOVAL OF THE DEPENDENCY REQUIREMENT IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN WIDOWS' PENSIONS

The bill (H. R. 3549) to modify eligibility requirements for payment of pension to certain widows of veterans of the Civil War, Indian Wars, and Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RENEWAL OF 5-YEAR LEVEL-PREMIUM-TERM INSURANCE FOR WORLD WAR II VETERANS

The bill (H. R. 4000) to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level-premium-term insurance for successive 5-year periods, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the purpose of this proposal is to permit the renewal of any National Service Life Insurance 5-year level-premium-term policy for successive periods of 5 years at the premium rate for the attained age and without medical examination.

Under the present law, any such policy issued on the term plan before January 1, 1948, may be renewed for an additional 5-year period.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is that the same as Calendar No. 464, House bill 1072, which has been passed? It seems to have the same purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the calendar number?

Mr. CORDON. Calendar No. 464, House bill 1072, to amend the existing law to provide the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies of United States Government life insurance.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Calendar No. 464, House bill 1072, provides that at the expiration of any 5-year period a World War I veteran may renew his United States Government life-insurance policy for an additional 5-year period at the premium rates for the attained age without medical examination.

Since the enactment of the original law, four extensions have been made of 5 years each to permit World War I veterans to continue their 5-year level-premium-term polices. The present bill would make unnecessary any additional legislation on this point by the Congress, since renewal would be permitted at the expiration of each preceding 5-year term.

Mr. CORDON. One bill is supplementary to the other.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The same basic principle is involved in both bills; is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is correct.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4000) to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level premium term insurance for successive 5-year periods, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 752) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER TO NAVY OF PROPERTY AT SHUMAKER, ARK.

The bill (S. 1403) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property at Shumaker, Ark., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer, without exchange of funds, to the custody and control of the Navy Department a parcel of land, with any improvements thereon, at the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Shumaker, in Calhoun County, Ark., containing 118 acres, more or less, being the same parcel of land described in a revocable permit from the War Food Administration to the Navy Department dated June 23, 1945, and which is now occupied and used as an integral part of the said ammunition depot.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN KLAMATH COUNTY, OREG., TO CITY OF KLAMATH FALLS

The bill (S. 540) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States

of America, in certain lands in Klamath County, Oreg., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Calendar 473, House bill 3018, seems to be an identical bill. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3018) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in certain lands in Klamath County, Oreg., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 540 is indefinitely postponed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 32 (a) (2) OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should appreciate having an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in 1950, the Congress passed, and the President approved, legislation to permit the alien property custodian to return property vested by him of American citizens who also possessed enemy nationality. That legislation contained a limitation of $5,000,000 on the aggregate value of the property which might be returned pursuant to that law. The limitation was not a part of the bill as it passed the Senate, but it was added to the bill by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

This limitation has caused a great deal of difficulty in the administration of the law and, in addition, there is the distinct possibility, according to the Department of Justice, that some American citizens will be unable to secure the return of their property under the law because of this limitation.

The committee felt that this limitation ought to be removed since the law passed by the Eighty-first Congress was designed to correct an inequitable situation entirely. The limitation in that law would only permit a partial correction of the situation.

The Department of Justice favors enactment of this legislation.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (D) of paragraph (2) of section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is amended by striking out everything beginning with the colon following the word "marriage" down to and including "$5,000,000" where it last appears therein.

TERUKO OKUAKI

The bill (S. 426) for the relief of Teruko Okuaki was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Teruko Okuaki, the Japanese fiancée of Martin Bronfenbrenner, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that the said Teruko Okuaki shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Teruko Okuaki is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to Martin Bronfenbrenner, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Teruko Okuaki, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155, 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Teruko Okuaki, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Teruko Okuaki as of the date of the payment by her of the required head tax and visa fee.

ROSITA ANITA NAVARRO AND RAMONA ALICIA NAVARRO

The bill (S. 462) for the relief of Rosita Anita Navarro and Ramona Alicia Navarro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Rosita Anita Navarro and Ramona Alicia Navarro, the minor children of Clara Fusako Takemoto Navarro, a citizen of the United States, and Francisco R. Navarro, a legal resident of the United States.

PAYMENT OF FEES TO THE CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1345) to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1363, ch. 854, sec. 1110), and the act of April 6, 1928 (45 Stat. 410, ch. 325), otherwise known as part of section 11-1509 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1940 edition, are amended by striking from them and, thereby, from section 11-1509 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia the following provisions:

"For receiving, keeping, and disbursing money in pursuance of any statute or order of court, including cash bail or bond or securities authorized by law or order of court to be deposited in lieu of other security, 1 percent of the amount so received, kept, and disbursed, or of the face value of such bonds or securities."

SEC. 2. From and after the approval of this act no fee shall be charged or collected by the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for any of the services enumerated in the provision stricken by section 1 hereof, regardless of whether such services were rendered prior to or after the approval of this act.

HERBERT H. HELLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 76) for the relief of Herbert H. Heller, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 6, after the words "date of", to strike out "his last entry into the United States" and insert "the enactment of this act," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Herbert H. Heller shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

LAWFUL ADMISSION FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 100) to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Maria Luisa Ajuria Lazpita, Maria Isabel Albizuri Aguirre, Maria Ignacia Arregui Urbieta, Aurora Eduarda Jauregui Gorozarri, Maria Begona Landaburu Azcue, Josefa Martinez Viqueira, Elvira Echevarria Goicoechea, Pastora Inchausti Susarragui, Jesusa Unzala Eguidazu, Gaudencia Fernandez Carton, Casilda Gomez Martinez, Victoriana Egues Saizar, Maria Blanca Ganchegui Alcorta, Benita Justa Izaguirre Zabalegui, and Teodora Jimenez Buey shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

TRYNTJE BIEREMA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 121) for the relief of Tryntje Bierema, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Tryntje Bierema shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the

enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

HELMUTH ASSMAS BALTHASAR RUSSOW AND VOLKER HARPE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 168) for the relief of Helmuth Assmas Balthasar Russow and Volker Harpe, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Helmuth Assmas Balthasar Russow and Volker Harpe shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

NICHOLAS PAPAECONOMOU

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 269) for the relief of Nicholas Papaeconomou, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the words "date of", to strike out "his last entry into the United States" and insert "the enactment of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Nicholas Papaeconomou, of Hinesburg, Vt., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the non-preference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Greece.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

HOWARD I. SMITH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 810) for the relief of Howard I. Smith, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$630" and insert "$585", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard I. Smith, of 4100 Arkansas Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., the sum of $585, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for financial losses suffered by him, including the abandonment of his personal property and forfeiture of advance rental payment, as an employee of the Economic Cooperation Administration, resulting from the emergency evacuation of Economic Cooperation Administration personnel from Shanghai, China, ordered by the United States State Department in May 1949: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SOPHIE STRAUSS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1133) for the relief of Sophie Strauss, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 11, after the word "available", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That there be given a suitable bond or undertaking approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, as a guaranty against the said Sophie Strauss becoming institutionalized at public expense or otherwise becoming a public charge.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sophie Strauss shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable bond or undertaking approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, as a guaranty against the said Sophie Strauss becoming institutionalized at public expense or otherwise becoming a public charge.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

DAVIS MIN LEE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1279) for the relief of Davis Min Lee, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien, Davis Min Lee, the minor unmarried child of Lee Tung Sing, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

FIRST LT. JAMES E. WILLCOX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 83) for the relief of First Lt. James E. Willcox, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,265"; and in line 11, after the word "on", to strike out "June 29, 1950" and insert "June 28, 1950", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to First Lt. James E. Willcox, of 2647 Southwest Thirty-third Court, Miami, Fla., the sum of $5,265, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his infant daughter, Patricia Ann Willcox, who died as a result of injuries received when she was struck by a United States Army truck in Munich, Germany, on June 28, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

E. C. BROWDER AND CHARLES KEYLON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1474) for the relief of E. C. Browder and Charles Kenyon, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the name "Charles", to strike out "Kenyon" and insert "Keylon", and on page 2, line 4, after the name "Charles", to strike out "Kenyon" and insert "Keylon", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. C. Browder and Charles Keylon, of Harriman, Tenn., the sum of $4,800, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for damages sustained by them when they were notified by the United States Government that condemnation proceedings previously instituted against the farm of E. C. Browder had been abandoned, and then notified at a later date that the Government intended to go forward with its condemnation proceedings, which actions by the Government caused the sale, purchase, and resale of farm equipment by E. C. Browder and his partner, Charles Keylon, and interfered substantially with farming operations: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed

guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of E. C. Browder and Charles Keylon."

KARL CHIMANI AND ADA CHIMANI

The bill (H. R. 702) for the relief of Karl Chimani and Ada Chimani was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BELA ABELES AND MARIA ABELES

The bill (H. R. 783) for the relief of Bela Abeles and Maria Abeles was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BROR RAINER HEIKEL

The bill (H. R. 791) for the relief of Bror Rainer Heikel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. GIZELLA KEZDY-REICH

The bill (H. R. 1096) for the relief of Mrs. Gizella Kezdy-Reich was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIE LOUISE SAGEROS

The bill (H. R. 1104) for the relief of Marie Louise Sageros was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUM YING

The bill (H. R. 1157) for the relief of Lum Ying was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. VASILIA PARSELLES

The bill (H. R. 1233) for the relief of Mrs. Vasilia Parselles was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SYLVIO LATINO

The bill (H. R. 1691) for the relief of Sylvio Latino was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SANAE IIDA

The bill (H. R. 1973) for the relief of Sanae Iida was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. IHOR SEVCENKO

The bill (H. R. 2064) for the relief of Dr. Ihor Sevcenko was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JOHANNA MARIA LUMMER VALENTINE

The bill (H. R. 2170) for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Maria Lummer Valentine was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. FLORENCE E. HOMANN AND SON, JOHN A. VILLAS

The bill (H. R. 2180) for the relief of Mrs. Florence E. Homann and her son, John A. Villas, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAMAR CALLOWAY

The bill (H. R. 2204) for the relief of Lamar Calloway was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BIAGIO POIDIMANI

The bill (H. R. 2299) for the relief of Biagio Poidimani was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

B. H. MANLEY

The bill (H. R. 2406) for the relief of B. H. Manley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARGIT HELENA FALK RABOFF

The bill (H. R. 2408) for the relief of Mrs. Margit Helena Falk Raboff was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARYANNA BOPPEL

The bill (H. R. 2455) for the relief of Mrs. Maryanna Boppel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO PAROLE OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

The bill (H. R. 3455) to amend section 4202 of title 18, United States Code, relating to parole of Federal prisoners, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from New Jersey would appreciate an explanation of the bill, since it involves parole from a Federal prison.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill attempts to alleviate a hardship presently existing in the law relating to parole. As it is now, a person serving a life sentence is eligible for parole after having served 15 years, but a person serving a sentence of 60 years, for example, would have to serve one-third of his sentence, or 20 years, before being eligible for parole. This bill would make such a person, sentenced to over 45 years, eligible for parole after 15 years.

Likewise, under the present law, a person sentenced to a year and a day in jail is eligible for parole after having served one-third of his sentence, or 4 months, whereas a person sentenced to any period less than a year and a day must serve the full sentence. This bill will permit the parole of any person sentenced for a period of 180 days or more, after having served one-third of his sentence.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill would also cut the time from 1 year and a day to 186 days?

Mr. McCARRAN. The period of eligibility; yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The period of eligibility. How much of that period of 180 days would the prisoner have to serve?

Mr. McCARRAN. Two months.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Two months. Very well. I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3455) to amend section 4202 of title 18, United States Code, relating to parole of Federal prisoners, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARGARETE KATHARINA METZ

The bill (H. R. 3665) for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Katharina Metz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RITA V. L. FLAHERTY

The bill (H. R. 3950) for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE TO PERMIT PHOTOGRAPHIC REPRODUCTION OF BUSINESS RECORDS AND THEIR INTRODUCTION IN EVIDENCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4106) to amend title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" by adding a new section thereto known as section 1732b to permit the photographic reproduction of business records and the introduction of the same in evidence, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

That title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" is hereby amended by adding a new section thereto, to be known as section 1732b to read as follows:

"§ 1732b. Photographic copies of records."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That section 1732 of title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judiciary and judicial procedure" is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately preceding the first paragraph thereof, and by adding a new subsection to read as follows.

On page 2, line 3, before the word "If", to insert "(b)"; in line 23, after the word "This", to strike out "Act" and insert "subsection"; on page 3, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 115 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1731 of such title, is amended by inserting, immediately underneath item 1731 in such analysis, the following new item:

"1732b. Photographic copies of records."

And on page 3, after the amendment just above stated, to insert:

SEC. 2. The analysis of section 1732 of chapter 115 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1731 of such title, is amended so as to read:

"1732. Record made in regular course of business; photographic copies."

SEC. 3. The catchline of section 1732, chapter 115 of title 28, United States Code, is amended so as to read:

"1732. Record made in regular course of business; photographic copies."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 1732 of title

28, United States Code, entitled 'Judiciary and judicial procedure' by adding a new subsection thereto 'To permit the photographic reproduction of business records and the introduction of the same in evidence'."

INVESTIGATION OF FUNDS AND SECURITIES OF THE SEVERAL INDIAN TRIBES

The bill (S. Res. 147) to investigate certain matters concerning funds and securities of the several Indian tribes was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the General Accounting Office is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the amounts of the funds and securities of the several Indiana tribes, including those of tribal organizations, whether held in the Treasury of the United States, in private banks or elsewhere, and the rates of interest on such funds, and such other information with respect to such funds for the period beginning on July 1, 1928, as it may deem pertinent, for the purpose of bringing up to date the report of the Comptroller General (S. Doc. 263, 70th Cong.) made pursuant to the Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year, 1928 (45 Stat. 887).

SEC. 2. The General Accounting Office shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of the study and investigation made pursuant to this resolution.

TRUST FUNDS OF SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES OF WIND RIVER RESERVATION

The bill (S. 950) to amend the act authorizing the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of such tribes under such act, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation," approved May 19, 1947 (61 Stat. 102), is amended by striking out "existing" and inserting in lieu thereof "any."

SEC. 2. The first proviso of section 3 of such act is amended by striking out "five" and inserting in lieu thereof "ten."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Senate bill 950, calendar 515, may be printed at length in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 541) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 950) to amend the act of May 19, 1947 (61 Stat. 102), so as to extend the 5-year limitation of time for an additional period of 5 years, having considered the same, report thereon with the recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

The purpose of this bill is to extend the 5-year limitation of time provided for in the act of May 19, 1947 (61 Stat. 102), authorizing the distribution per capita semiannually of two-thirds of the trust funds of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes, and to amend the said act of May 19, 1947, so that not only the earnings and income of said tribes from oil royalties but from all other sources be available for such per capita distribution.

Your committee is informed that the distribution of two-thirds of said trust funds semiannually, in accordance with the provisions of the said act of May 19, 1947, is being administered satisfactorily; and the Indians, by assuming the responsibility of handling this much of their own money, are being taught to make their own decisions in the making use of their money without governmental supervision.

These Indian tribes have a substantial annual income from oil royalties from oil production on tribal lands and are soon to receive a payment for lands used by the Government in the construction of the Boysen Dam project, one of the features of the Missouri Basin development program.

An analysis of the joint funds of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes follows:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO INDIANS

Analysis of joint funds segregated pursuant to the act of May 19, 1947, Sept. 23, 1947, to July 1, 1951

	14X7145 consolidated funds, Shoshone Indians	14X7146 consolidated funds, Arapaho Indians
Funds reserved for per capita payments:		
Segregated under act of May 19, 1947	$233, 237. 14	$223, 380. 37
Revenue to July 1, 1951	1, 812, 378. 52	1, 818, 278. 08
Total credits to July 1, 1951	2, 045, 615. 66	2, 041, 658. 45
Per capita payments to July 1, 1951	1, 853, 889. 47	1, 850, 207. 28
Available for per capita as of July 1, 1951	191, 726. 19	191, 451. 17
Funds reserved for tribal use:		
Segregated under act of May 19, 1947	259, 018. 57	253, 390. 18
Revenue to July 1, 1951	910, 827. 10	913, 743. 61
Total credits to July 1, 1951	1, 169, 845. 67	1, 167, 133. 79
Tribal expenditures authorized	136, 158. 98	143, 911. 34
Available for tribal use as of July 1, 1951	1, 033, 686. 69	1, 023, 222. 45

Other available funds as of July 1, 1951

Shoshone:	
14X7645 Interest and accruals on interest, consolidated funds, Shoshone Indians:	
General tribal budget	$7, 138. 02
Per capita	14, 019. 86
	21, 157. 88
14X7126 Shoshone Indians, Wind River Reservation, Wyo., judgment fund	912, 444. 16
14X7626 Interest and accruals on interest, Shoshone Indians, Wind River Reservation, Wyo., judgment fund	21, 968. 15
14X7132 Revolving loan fund, Shoshone Indians, Wind River Reservation, Wyo	91, 643. 78
14X7632 Interest and accruals on interest, revolving loan fund, Shoshone Indians, Wind River Reservation, Wyo	22, 510. 48
Arapaho:	
14X7646 Interest and accruals on interest, consolidated funds, Arapaho Indians:	
General tribal budget	6, 961. 31
Per capita	13, 852. 04
	20, 813. 35

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill (S. 950), as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italics; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"61 STATUTES 102

"SEC. 2. The Comptroller of the United States, upon request of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized and directed to establish a trust-fund account for each tribe, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such transfer of funds on the books of his department as may be necessary to effect the purpose of section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That interest shall accrue on the principal fund only, at the rate of 4 percent per annum, and shall be credited to the interest trust-fund accounts established by this section: *Provided further*, That all future revenues derived from the Wind River Reservation under [existing] *any* law shall be divided in accordance with section 1 of this act and credited to the principal trust-fund accounts established herein.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, the trust funds credited to the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapaho Tribe, respectively, under the provisions of this act, shall be available for expenditure or for advance to the tribe for such purposes as may be requested by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary of the Interior or such official as may be designated by him: *Provided*, That two-thirds of said trust funds as initially established, and two-thirds of all sums credited thereto during a period of [five] *ten* years from and after the enactment of this act, shall be paid on the first day of September and the first day of March each year, per capita, to the individual members of said tribes, and any sums distributed per capita out of the funds described in section 1 of this act on or after April 1, 1947, shall be taken into consideration in determining the sums to be distributed under this proviso to the same effect as if this act had been in force on and after April 1, 1947: *Provided further*, That said per capita payments shall not be subject to any lien or claim of any nature against any of the members of said tribes unless the tribal council of such member shall consent thereto in writing, except as to reimbursable Treasury loans made to individual members of either tribe which may be due to the United States, and except as to irrigation charges owed by individual Indians to the United States, but this latter exception shall not become operative until a report upon irrigation charges with the Wind River irrigation project has been made and becomes effective in accordance with the act of July 1, 1932 (ch. 369, 47 Stat. 564)."

CREATION OF COMMISSION TO STUDY ADMINISTRATION OF OVERSEAS ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

The bill (S. 1166) to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I send to the desk an amendment, which I shall ask to have stated at the appropriate time.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1166) to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government and make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, with amendments, on page 1 line 3, after the word "a", to insert "bipartisan" on page 2, line 1, after the word "President.", to insert "Of each class of four members mentioned in this section, two members shall be from each of the two major political parties."; in line 21, after the word "than", to strike out "March 1, 1953", and insert "1 year after the first meeting of the Commission, and/or at such time or times as the Commission deems necessary."; on page 3, line 1, after the word "of", to strike out "1923", and insert "1949", and in line 25, after the word "exist", to strike out "on April 1, 1953" and insert "not later than 1 year after its first meeting. The Chairman of the Commission shall advise the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the date of its first meeting in writing. Official notification of such meeting shall also be made to the President of the United States, and published in the Federal Register.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Overseas Administration (hereinafter called the "Commission"), which shall be composed of four Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, four Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker, and four persons in the executive branch of the Government appointed by the President. Of each class of four members mentioned in this section, two members shall be from each of the two major political parties. Any vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. The members of the Commission shall serve without additional compensation by reason of such membership, but they shall be allowed and paid their necessary travel and subsistence expenses while away from their official station on the business of the Commission.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

SEC. 3. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a study of the administraiton of the overseas activities of the Federal Government, with a view to making recommendation to the Congress with respect to means for coordinating and integrating such activities. The Commission shall complete its study and make a report of its findings and recommendations to Congress not later than 1 year after the first meeting of the Commission and/or at such time or times as the Commission deems necessary.

SEC. 5. The Commission is authorized, with regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions. The Commission may also contract for services and employ part-time consultants on a per diem basis.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission, or any member thereof, may, when authorized by a majority of the Commission, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

SEC. 7. The Commission shall cease to exist not later than 1 year after its first meeting. The Chairman of the Commission shall advise the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the date of its first meeting in writing. Official notification of such meeting shall also be made to the President of the United States, and published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I now ask for action on my amendment, and request that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 10, immediately after the comma, it is proposed to insert: "require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers and documents."

On page 3, line 14, immediately after the period, it is proposed to insert:

Sections 102 and 104 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (2 U. S. C. 192, 194), shall be applicable in the case of the failure of any person to comply with the requirements of any subpena issued and served upon him by the Commission.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by way of explanation, the amendment which I have offered merely gives the Commission sought to be created by the bill the right of subpena.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that the entire purpose of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes. The purpose of the amendment is merely to give the power of subpena to the Commission which it is sought to create under the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill (S. 1166) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, with respect to Senate bill 1166, Calendar No. 516, I inquire how many members are to compose the Commission?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is a 12-man Commission. Four are to be appointed by the President of the Senate, four are to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, and the other four, on behalf of the executive branch of the Government, are to be appointed by the President of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. How long does their term of office last? Are the terms of office staggered, or are the terms for the life of the Commission?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The terms are for the life of the Commission.

Mr. WHERRY. The Commissioners are all to be appointed at one time, and the term of office is for 1 year. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any provision made with respect to the members coming from more than one political party?

Mr. McCLELLAN. They must be equally divided between the two major parties. The President of the Senate can appoint any Members of the Senate. All Members are eligible.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it is a good thing to establish such a Commission. How much does the Senator feel will be involved by way of appropriations?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That will depend upon the recommendation of the commission. A similar bill was passed by the Senate last year without objection, and went to the House, where no action was taken.

PREDATORY SEA LAMPREYS OF THE GREAT LAKES

The bill (H. R. 2995) to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The bill (S. 1146) to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated at the appropriate time.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1146) to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with amendments on page 4, after line 19, to strike out:

(b) The Commission shall submit a final report of its activities, and the results of its studies to the Congress on or before the end of the second fiscal year which commences after the enactment of this act, and shall

cease to exist upon the submission of such final report.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

(b) The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time or times as the Commission deems necessary, shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the Congress on or before December 31, 1952, and shall submit its final report not later than March 31, 1953, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission shall propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments, and administrative actions, as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations with respect to each level of government.

At the top of page 6, to insert:

(c) The Commission shall advise and consult with representatives of labor, industry, commerce, agriculture, taxpayers' organizations, State and local governments, and other interested groups, and may establish such advisory committee or committees as may be desirable from among such representatives. Members of any such advisory committee may be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them at the direction of the Commission in the performance of their duties.

And on page 6, line 10, to reletter the subsection from "(c)" to "(d)" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc.—

FINDINGS OF FACT

SECTION 1. Since the establishment of the Federal system of government, no comprehensive survey has been made by the Congress of the relationships existing among the National, State, and local governments of the United States; of the allocation of governmental functions and powers among these three governmental levels, or of the distribution of jurisdiction of governmental functions and powers exercised by two or more governmental authorities. Prior to a determination of necessity or desirability of a reallocation of functions and powers or of redistribution of jurisdiction over them among the levels of the Federal system, it is necessary that such a study and survey be made. It is the belief of the Congress that such a study and survey of past and present conditions and the determination of what legislation should be proposed can best be accomplished through the cooperative efforts of officials of government and representatives of the people.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a temporary national bipartisan commission to be known as the National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two of whom shall be officers of the executive branch of the Government, and two private citizens;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two of whom shall be Members of the Senate, and two private citizens; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two of whom shall be Members of the House and two private citizens.

(b) Each person appointed as a member shall be experienced with, or have knowledge of, the major problems in the field of intergovernmental relations. Of the members enumerated in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), not more than two members in each class shall be from any one political party. Any vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall not affect the Commission's powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(d) Four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to submit to the Congress specific recommendations based upon a study of—

(1) (A) the past and present relations between the National, State, and local governments of the United States; (B) the past and present allocation of governmental functions and powers among the National, State, and local governments of the United States; (C) governmental functions and powers exercised by two or more such governments, and the distribution of jurisdiction over such functions exercised by each such government;

(2) the fiscal relations among the National, State, and local governments with a view of determining the possibilities, and mechanism for achieving, on a continuous basis, consistency in the fiscal policies of the several levels of governments. In making such study the Commission shall give particular attention to (A) intergovernmental tax immunities in terms of the problems they create for governments and taxpayers, and means for resolving these problems; (B) revenue sources and means for reducing or eliminating intergovernmental tax competition; and (C) grants-in-aid, tax sharing, and other similar measures for adjusting financial resources to the needs of State and local governments, with a view to proposing guides to the use of such devices and improvements in their operation.

(b) The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time or times as the Commission deems necessary, shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the Congress on or before December 31, 1952, and shall submit its final report not later than March 31, 1953, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission shall propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments, and administrative actions, as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations with respect to each level of government.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out this act, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission. The Commission may delegate the powers conferred by this subsection to any member or to a group of members of the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

(c) The Commission shall advise and consult with representatives of labor, industry, commerce, agriculture, taxpayers' organizations, State and local governments, and other interested groups, and may establish such advisory committee or committees as may be desirable from among such representatives. Members of any such advisory committee may be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them at the direction of the Commission in the performance of their duties.

(d) The Commission shall have the power, without regard to the civil-service laws, to appoint and fix the compensation of an executive secretary, who shall be the chief administrative officer of the Commission, and such other personnel as it deems advisable, but the rates of compensation of such personnel shall not exceed the rates prescribed in the Classification Act of 1949 for comparable duties.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission who are appointed from among Members of Congress or from the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress or in the executive branch, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission, other than those to whom subsection (a) is applicable, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 12, after the words "such hearings,", it is proposed to insert "require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents."

On page 5, line 18, after the period, it is proposed to insert:

Sections 102 and 104 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (2 U. S. C. 192, 194), shall be applicable in the case of the failure of any person to comply with the requirements of any subpena issued and served upon him by the Commission.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey is the same as that offered in connection with a previous bill, is it not?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I will say that the junior Senator from New Jersey is merely seeking to give the Commission the power of subpena.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I believe to be satisfactory to the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I ask to have the amendment stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 16, it is proposed to add a new subsection, as follows:

(e) Prior to making the appointments of members of the Commission as prescribed in paragraph (2) of this section, the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall consult with and be advised by representatives of organizations of State and local governmental officials.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. It simply amounts to a suggestion on the part of the Congress that in connection with appointments to the proposed Commission the appointing officers consult with the organizations mentioned in the amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. It is the thought of the Senator from Ohio that the local and State government officials, both of whom are already thoroughly acquainted with representatives at the central office, should be consulted before the appointments are made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared dealing with the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

A few days ago when the senior Senator from Maryland reported this bill out of committee, I stated my intention to speak more at length upon the measure when it was reached during the call of the calendar.

As I arise today to avail myself of that privilege, I want to say first of all that the subject of intergovernmental relations in this country is one in which I have long had a personal and vital interest. It was my privilege to represent my home State of New Jersey for 14 years as a member of the interstate commission on the Delaware River Basin, popularity known as INCODEL.

It was as a member of this commission that I first became deeply conscious of the value of interstate cooperation.

Later I became a member of the board of managers of the Council of State Governments and here again I saw at close hand the importance of intergovernmental relations as between our 48 States.

Indeed, it was as the chairman of the board of managers of the Council of State Governments that I first fully realized the vast importance of well coordinated intergovernmental relations at all levels of government.

When I became a Member of this distinguished body approximately 2½ years ago, I early sponsored a bill S. 810, Eighty-first Congress for a the creation of a commission similar to the one which S. 1146 of this session seeks to establish.

I refer, of course, to the bill now before us.

I firmly believe that this problem of interlevel and interjurisdictional relations is one of the most important of all the problems facing the American people today and nothing would give me greater satisfaction than to know that I had personally been able to make some small contribution toward the more effective handling of the complex and difficult situations which almost daily now develop in the general field of intergovernmental relations.

The subject of Federal-State relations has been one of major concern since the days of the founding of the Republic. Even before the present Government was established, there were controversies under the Articles of Confederation, and during the Constitutional Convention of 1787, relating to the proper allocation of governmental authority as between the Federal Government and the States. Throughout the life of the present Government, these questions have constantly been before our people; sometimes to be sure, they have been more actively discussed than at others, but they have always been present. And I suspect that, as long as our society continues to possess the dynamic qualities that have always characterized it in the past, they always will continue to be present.

There are many reasons why this subject is of supreme importance at the present time.

The whole character of our Federal system has been changing before our very eyes, yet without our fully realizing it.

The Constitution provides a general pattern for these relationships—a pattern which describes the form of government that we formerly had and that the people assume we still have.

Actually the character of American federalism in the middle of the twentieth century is something vastly different from what it was at the turn of the century, or from what it was even 25 years ago.

Among the changes that have been—and still are—taking place, I would mention first the pronounced tendency for governmental activities and services to be transferred up the line, to successively larger units for administration.

In this growing dependence on larger units of government, functions have been transferred from the smaller rural units to the counties, from the counties and cities to the States, and from the States to the Federal Government.

Now, as we contemplate the development and strengthening of institutions of world government, it appears not unlikely that some few limited powers which have long been regarded as the attributes of a sovereign state may have to be transferred to a world government.

This constant shift of power and responsibility from smaller units to larger ones has been due, not alone to the grasping tendencies and empire-building propensities of bureaucrats, but to the simple fact that the development of improved methods of transportation, communication, and machine design has made it absolutely necessary for government to function in larger units if it was to function effectively, or in some cases, if it was to function at all.

Restricted territorial areas, once necessary, simply do not fit into the pattern of the modern age of technical and scientific development.

Not only have governmental units for administrative purposes tended to become larger, but the fiscal relationships between the units have changed.

Time was—and not so long ago—when each individual tax source was assigned or designated for the use of particular governmental units. Now, all units from the largest to the smallest, in grab-bag fashion, attempt to collect about all the revenue they can from all available sources.

The situation is well-nigh chaotic. The larger units, by virtue of their greater size, having a broader taxing base than the smaller, thus tend to monopolize all of the more productive sources of revenue, leaving few, indeed, available for the smaller units. These smaller units are thus encouraged to go, hat in hand, begging grants-in-aid, the cities from the States, and the States from the Federal Government.

This grant-in-aid problem is a particularly important aspect of the whole intergovernmental relations picture.

Distributions of public lands, and to a lesser degree of public funds, had been made by the Federal Government to the States from time to time over the years.

The grants were made to aid the States in particular programs, often experimental.

The system did not get into full operation until after 1914, following the adoption of the income-tax amendment; it was not until the period of the depression and the years since that it began to operate in high gear.

Total Federal expenditures for this purpose have grown from a few hundred thousand dollars to a total of well over $2,000,000,000 a year, which is a sizable amount even in a total budget so large as that under which the Federal Government is now operating.

Grants are no longer regarded as a means of assistance in the support of experimental undertakings, but as a regular source of financial support for necessary and well-established governmental functions.

Our Federal system has changed in still another way.

Until fairly recently, each level of government had certain duties and responsibilities clearly and definitely assigned to it.

The local units carried on police functions. The States built roads.

The Federal Government was responsible for the national security. Things are no longer so simple.

It has now come to be true that no single unit or level of government is any longer completely responsible for any one important governmental function.

In the new system of cooperative federalism, the Federal Government and the States and the local units are jointly and collectively responsible for police work, road building, agriculture, military and civil defense, and many, many more activities.

Meanwhile, institutions of local government are being transformed. Some of the smaller local units which no longer have any functions to perform or any reason for continued existence, are drying up.

School districts are being consolidated one with another, in substantial numbers.

More and more so-called authorities are being created to carry on activities of a business nature.

Special districts, larger than the previously existing local units, are being established all over the country for a variety of purposes such as flood control, soil conservation, mosquito abatement, health and sanitation and many more.

As old units atrophy and fall into disuse, new and different ones arise to take their place.

Truly it may be said that local government in this country is in a state of transition.

I thus refer to some of the major changes in this field by way of emphasizing the need for exactly the type of study that such a commission as this bill proposes would provide.

I do not say that these changes are good or that they are bad, for I do not know. I do not believe that anyone knows. That is why we need the commission to find out.

What we do know is that the changes in the previously existing structure have been many and of far-reaching significance.

We know that they have been made on a more or less haphazard basis, without any plan or any consideration of their over-all effect.

We have neither any understanding of how we got into the mess that we are in,

nor any idea of what course we should attempt to follow in the future.

We do know that these tremendous changes have all taken place within the existing constitutional structure, without any formal or visible change in the character of that structure.

They have been made almost unbeknown to the average citizen, who still labors under the delusion that the brand of georgraphical federalism established by the Constitution still exists.

Actually, it has been very largely supplanted by the new cooperative federalism based upon a functional integration of the efforts of all three levels of government in many different areas.

I believe that this survey is vitally necessary at this time.

We need to have a careful analysis of how we got where we are, and on the basis of the facts so revealed, to chart our course for the future.

It may be said that this would be just another survey, with just another report to be filed away and forgotten.

With that point of view, I beg to differ.

We have never had a thorough and comprehensive survey of this whole problem; that is one reason why I think it is so important that we have this one now.

To be sure, there have been numerous studies of the administration of particular functions in particular States or regions, but these studies have all been made on a piece-meal basis, geographically or functionally or both.

The report of the Hoover Commission has been neither ignored, neglected, nor forgotten. What I propose is that we apply the technique used so successfully in the field of executive reorganization to this whole vast and equally important field of intergovernmental relations.

In place of the piecemeal approach I propose that a distinguished national Commission whose members would be nonpartisan in their point of view and representative of the various governmental and group interests involved be authorized and directed to study the whole problem, and to make recommendations with regard thereto. I would give them sufficient time to do a thorough job, for the task is one of monumental proportions.

I would give them sufficient funds to make possible the employment of a high-grade professional staff, without whose assistance the job cannot be done at all. Out of the work of such a Commission I would hope that we might realize at least three specific benefits.

In the first place, I would expect a kind of blueprint or plan for the development of our intergovernmental relations in the future—Federal-State, interstate, State-local, and Federal-local.

It seems plain to me that we can ill afford to continue blundering along as we have been doing, and that we cannot expect to follow a plan unless we have a plan to follow.

In developing such a plan I assume that the Commission would consider carefully the relation of existing constitutional requirements to the needs of the present day.

In the second place, I assume that once the facts are ascertained and the plan developed, some suitable provision would be made for carrying it out.

The Hoover Commission recommended that the Commission provided for in this bill be set up on a permanent basis.

I have never believed, and I do not believe now, that this would be wise.

As the senior Senator from Maryland pointed out when he presented the report of the committee, there is nothing to prevent making this Commission permanent if that should prove to be desirable.

I believe the committee did the right thing in leaving this matter open for future determination.

I am not sure just what form the permanent agency should take or where in the Government it should be located.

I have some ideas on the subject, but I shall not attempt to develop them at this time.

This is a matter which can best be decided after the study Commission has ascertained the facts and presented its recommendations.

A third benefit which I hope may flow from the work of this Commission would be the establishment at some suitable location here in Washington of a central clearing house for information relating to all matters in the field of State and local government, law, and administration and intergovernmental relations.

Such a development is, in my opinion, absolutely essential if we are to conduct the affairs of our Federal system of government in an orderly way. This task of putting our Federal system in order and of keeping it so must be regarded as a continuing responsibility. Important as the work of the study commission is, that alone will not keep the problems solved.

There must be a permanent agency to carry the work forward on a continuing basis, but such an agency must have adequate and up-to-date current information. Government cannot function effectively in any quarter without such information.

At the present time, there is no central agency dealing with the problems of State and local government and intergovernmental relations. Fiscal data and data on the number and character of the units of local government is maintained in one department. This department also used to collect election statistics but this activity was suspended on grounds of "economy." Some information on State legislation is maintained in another agency, the scope of this service also having been curtailed on grounds of "economy." Scattered all over Washington, in one executive department and agency after another, there are little offices trying to keep track of State legislation on agriculture, social security, power problems, labor laws, health laws, and a dozen other things. How much better off everyone would be if this job could be done completely and thoroughly in one central place, servicing all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, the State and local governments, as well as private organizations desiring this type of information.

I hope that some such development may grow out of the work of the study commission on intergovernmental relations. We must remember at all times that in a Federal system of government like our own, the central government has a definite duty and responsibility for maintaining certain services such as this, services which are of benefit to all, but which the State and local units are not in a position to support and maintain individually. Even if they were, there would be no justification for asking 48 States to duplicate services which could be done better and cheaper in one central place.

In concluding my remarks on this important subject, there are two points which I would like to emphasize.

In the first place, the subject matter of this bill is not a party matter, it is an American matter, which relates in a very vital way to the form and structure of our governmental system. On the basic character of this system as established by the Constitution, all Americans are pretty well agreed.

The purpose of this study commission is to help us to preserve, under new and different conditions, the fundamental characteristics of the Federal system provided for by the Constitution.

I call attention of the Members of this body to the fact that the list of sponsors of this bill includes 34 Senators, drawn more or less evenly from the two major parties.

Of this number, 14, I believe, have served as governors of their respective States, and 1 has been mayor for 4 years of one of the Nation's great cities. All have had extensive experience in public affairs.

The bill has the endorsement of the appropriate committee and subcommittee of this body. On the basis of this extensive bipartisan support, I urge each and every one of my colleagues to give this bill their personal endorsement by voting for it.

The main question raised by the bill is very simple and very clear. It is simply this: What kind of government do we want in these United States?—a highly centralized system in which all power and authority is concentrated in the Nation's Capital, or the Federal system with which we started which seeks to leave as many major responsibilities in the hands of the State and local governments as they are capable of discharging economically and efficiently?

A vote for this bill is a vote for doing what can be done at this time and under the circumstances toward the following of the latter course.

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

The bill (S. 1146) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION ACT

The bill (S. 1376) providing for the dissolution of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the transfer of certain functions related to national defense heretofore vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was announced as next in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF THE MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING STAMP ACT OF MARCH 16, 1934

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 509) to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451, 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments in line 5, after "16 U. S. C.", to strike out "718b" and insert "718d"; and in line 7, after the word "number", to strike out "75" and insert "85", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718d), as amended is further amended by deleting the number "90" and inserting in lieu thereof the number "85" and subsection (b) of said section 4 is amended by inserting the words "in enforcing and" immediately after the words "The remainder shall be available for expenses" as they appear therein.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—the title of the bill does not indicate exactly what the bill does. I think the RECORD should contain an explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to permit a large share of the migratory-bird conservation fund—the duck-stamp fund—to be used for enforcement and administrative purposes.

When the Fish and Wildlife Service which is where the bill originated, sent it to the Congress, it asked that 25 percent of the revenue received from the sale of duck stamps be used for administrative purposes. Our committee gave consideration to the matter and decided that we would support an increase of 5 percent, that is, making the total 15 percent instead of 25 percent. The Fish and Wildlife Service now receives 10 percent. While it is clearly shown in the testimony before our committee that it needs some additional funds to administer the program, we have a feeling that 5 percent additional will give the agency the additional funds which it needs. Next year it can report to Congress, and if it needs additional funds, Congress can consider the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718d), as amended."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. No doubt a statement has already been made upon the subject, but as I understand, it is his intention, after the call of the calendar is completed, that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, when the agricultural appropriation bill will be taken up.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. There are several Senators who wish to make a few remarks after which there will be no further business today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST ATTACK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 537) to provide for the greater security and defense of the United States against attack, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That section 606 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Upon proclamation by the President that there exists war or a threat of war, or a state of public peril or disaster or other national emergency, or in order to preserve the neutrality of the United States, the President, if he deems it necessary in the interest of national security or defense, may suspend or amend, for such time as he may see fit, the rules and regulations applicable to any or all stations or devices capable of emitting electromagnetic radiations within the jurisdiction of the United States as prescribed by the Commission, and may cause the closing of any station for radio communication, or any device capable of emitting electromagnetic radiations between 10 kilocycles and 100,000 megocycles, which is suitable for use as a navigational aid beyond 5 miles, and the removal therefrom of its apparatus and equipment, or he may authorize the use or control of any such station or device and/or its apparatus and equipment, by any department of the Government under such regulations as he may prescribe upon just compensation to the owners."

SEC. 2. Section 606 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h) Any person who willfully and knowingly does or causes or suffers to be done any act, matter, or thing prohibited or declared to be unlawful pursuant to the exercise of the President's powers and authority under this section, or who willfully and knowingly omits or fails to do any act, matter, or thing which he is required to do pursuant to exercise of the President's powers and authority under this section, or who willfully and knowingly causes or suffers such omission or failure shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for such offense by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for a term of not more than 1 year, or both, and, if a firm, partnership, association, or corporation, be fined not more than $5,000."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—here again we have a title which does not fully disclose the major purposes of the bill. An explanation in the RECORD would be very helpful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Senate bill 537 as originally introduced, generally provides executive authority to control the use of all electromagnetic radiation devices not only during hostilities or a proclaimed emergency, but also during time of strained international relationship when a surprise attack on the United States is possible. Terms of the original bill were broad enough to include not only radio transmission devices but diathermy machines, testing equipment and radio service shops, switches, fluorescent signs, circuit breakers, and so forth.

This bill came from the National Defense Agency. When it was first brought to Congress it was referred to the Armed Services Committee. As the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has charge of communications, we felt that that was intruding on our jurisdiction, and we asked that the bill be transferred to our committee. It was so transferred.

There is existing law on this subject. Under section 606 (c) of the Communications Act, the President is authorized to control or use radio stations and their apparatus under certain emergency conditions. The authority of the President under that section is limited to electronic devices used in transmitting radio communications, and does not include all devices capable of emitting radiations useful to enemy aircraft for navigational purposes.

In other words, an ordinary motor, unless it has been carefully constructed, may emit signals which can be used by operators of enemy planes to reach any point they may wish to reach. Motors, diathermy machines, and all other apparatus of that kind emit signals, and at the present time there is no control. No one is in control over such signals. We already have in the law control over regular broadcasting instruments, but the bill would give the Federal Communications Commission responsibility to look after other machines, which were not built for the transmission of signals, but which do emit signals. It is a safety measure of very high importance.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for his explanation. I commend his committee for this proposed legislation. It is obviously very necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to further amend the Communications Act of 1934."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3282) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This bill is the unfinished business, and will be passed over.

PROPOSAL TO NAME AN AIRCRAFT CARRIER THE "FORRESTAL"

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) to provide that an aircraft carrier shall be named the *Forrestal* was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STIMULATION OF VOLUNTEER ENLISTMENTS IN THE REGULAR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—CORRECTION OF ERROR IN ACT OF JUNE 28, 1947

The bill (H. R. 1200) to correct an error in section 1 of the act of June 28, 1947, "to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OPERATION OF MESS UNDER DIRECTION OF A SUPPLY CORPS OFFICER

The bill (H. R. 1201) to amend secton 4 of of the act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, so as to provide that a mess operated under the direction of a Supply Corps officer can be operated either on a quantity or on a monetary-ration basis, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORENCE GRACE POND WHITEHILL

The bill (H. R. 1834) for relief of Florence Grace Pond Whitehill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLOTHING AND EQUIPMENT FOR CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN AT THE ACADEMIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2736) to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midship-

men at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 2, after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 183 of title 14 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 183. Cadets; initial clothing allowance.

"The Secretary may prescribe a sum which shall be credited to each new cadet upon first admission to the Academy, to cover the cost of his initial clothing and equipment issue, which sum shall be deducted subsequently from his pay. Each cadet discharged prior to graduation who is indebted to the United States on account of advances of pay to purchase required clothing and equipment shall be required to turn in to the Academy all clothing and equipment of a distinctively military nature to the extent required to discharge such indebtedness; and, if the value of such clothing and equipment to turned in does not cover the indebtedness incurred, then such indebtedness shall be canceled."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and the Coast Guard Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes."

DECORATIONS FOR SURVIVORS OF VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3911) to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 2, line 3, after the word "during" where it occurs at the end of line 2, to insert "World War I"; in the same line, after the word "War", to strike out "II" and insert "II,"; in line 16, after the word "during", to insert "World War I"; in line 17, after the word "War", to strike out "II" and insert "II,"; on page 3, line 19, after the word "adoption", to strike out "and", and in the same line, after "(e)", to insert "the term 'World War I' shall include the period extending from April 6, 1917, to March 3, 1921; and (f)."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the committee for its prompt action on the bill. The support of this proposal to grant recognition to the bereaved survivors of those killed in action while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States is certainly appropriate. It may seem that the legislation is unimportant in the light of many urgent matters which confront the Senate in this critical period, but I assure Senators that it is vitally important to the several thousand Americans concerned. While it is true that nothing can begin to compensate the wives, mothers, and famililes of the men who have so nobly given their lives for the principles of world freedom and justice, these small buttons are a shining symbol of their sacrifice.

Mr. President, I have received many letters in regard to this bill. I am happy that the committee acted promptly, and I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Committee on Armed Services I thank the distinguished majority leader for his comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO HIGHLAND FALLS, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 385) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The bill is obviously not a calendar measure. Therefore, I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). The bill will be passed over.

That completes the call of the calendar.

DEATH OF ADMIRAL FORREST P. SHERMAN

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, all of us have been touched and grieved by the sudden death of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman. He was indeed a military genius, and performed outstanding service in behalf of his country. I wish to express my deep sympathy to his family.

The loss of Admiral Sherman will be felt seriously, particularly at this time when he was playing such an important role in national and international affairs.

It would have been difficult to find another who could have so efficiently handled the task which fell to his lot during recent times. He helped to bring unity within our military services, and under his leadership our Navy is an efficient, fighting force with all hands, officers and enlisted men alike, displaying the highest morale.

His untimely death is a blow to all of us; to the Navy he loved and fought for; to the country to whom he had dedicated his life, and to his beloved family. They have our sincerest condolences in this hour of their grief.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to add a word to the statement of the distinguished majority leader with respect to the death of Admiral Sherman. It was my privilege to be associated with him in congressional work relating to the Defense Establishment during the period in which he served as Chief of Naval Operations and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Admiral Sherman was a great naval leader. He was a great American. His passing is a distinct loss not only to this country, but to the cause of free men everywhere in the world.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to have the record show that at the hearing this morning of the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the Committee on Appropriations, with the representatives of the Navy appearing before it, the subcommittee took action to express its deep sorrow over the death of Admiral Sherman. As chairman I can testify to the fact that the admiral made a very deep impression upon the members of the subcommittee by his appearances and his testimony before it. He was not only a man of distinct achievements as a naval leader, but he was also in every degree of the word a statesman whose concern was for the safety of his country and the protection of the principles upon which the Nation was founded. The Navy, the Government of the United States, the people of the United States, and, for that matter, the people of the world, I believe, have suffered a great loss in the sudden termination of the life of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman at the very height of his achievements.

WILLIAM O. STEVENS—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 662, for the relief of William O. Stevens, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service approved a similar bill in the Eighty-first Congress. However, it has been determined that the retirement systems for professors at our service academies are separate systems and not part of the regular civil-service retirement system. They are administered exclusively by the departments having jurisdiction.

Therefore, it is the opinion of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that it has no jurisdiction in this matter, but that the Committee on Armed Services has jurisdiction.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request of the Senator from South Carolina. Of course, bills of this nature have been handled in the past by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. That is why I had requested that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. If the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service feels that the bill properly belongs in the Committee on Armed Services, our committee will undertake to see that justice is done to those affected by the bill.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was detained from the Chamber at the outset of today's session because the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Defense was in session. Therefore it was not until I reached the floor that I learned that objection had been made during the call of the calendar to Senate bill 50 and Senate bill 49, Calendar Nos. 295 and 296, which are, respectively, bills for the admission as States of the Union, the Territory of Alaska and the Territory of Hawaii. Of course, it was to be expected that objection would be made to the bills on the call of the calendar, because a great deal of controversy has been raised with respect to the measures, although it quite clearly appears from the evidence which was received by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that a clear majority of the Congress of the United States is in favor of the enactement of the two bills.

I do not wish to have the occasion pass without making reference to the bills, particularly because last evening I was very much honored by the Boys' Nation, which is now in session in Washington, by being invited to American University to talk to the young men from all over the United States in response to their request, upon the two statehood bills.

BOYS' NATION INTERESTED

It seemed to me very significant, indeed, that the members of Boys' Nation, which, as every Member of the Senate knows, is an organization created upon the initiative of the American Legion to foster the knowledge of government and of the principles of free institutions, should have desired a discussion of these two bills. The Boys' Nation is composed of youngsters now in high school. Two members from each State in the Union are now in attendance upon the sessions in Washington. They are studying the operation of the Congress. They are studying the bills which are before Congress. Before the week is out they will assemble in the old Chamber of the Senate, which later became the chamber of the Supreme Court of the United States, and there, on the 26th of July, I understand the Vice President of the United States will address these young men.

The fact that they were in the city last night, and that they wanted to discuss the sifinificance of these two statehood bills, prompts me to make note of the fact in the RECORD and to give a summary of some of the points to which I called their attention last night.

It seemed to me to be very significant, Mr. President, that they were meeting in Washington in the month of July 1951, and that in July 1787 the Continental Congress, the Congress which preceded the Constitutional Convention, adopted the Ordinance of 1787, which provided for the Government of the Northwest Territory, the area which lies west of New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, and Maryland, and east of the Mississippi River, and "northwest of the River Ohio."

I pointed out to these young men that in the Ordinance of 1787, the Continental Congress or the Confederate Congress, as I believe it was officially called at that time, incorporated the Northwest Territory into the United States, thereby holding out to the people of that area that when the time came when they were capable of supporting statehood, the area would be admitted to the Federal Union on an equal footing with the existing States of the Union. There, for the first time, even before the Constitution was formally ratified, Congress was saying with respect to those who inhabited the Northwest Territory, "This area may be divided into five States, and these five States will be admitted into the Federal Union 'on an equal footing with the original States.' "

THE TRADITION OF 1787

Mr. President, this is significant because ever since that time, whenever any territory has been incorporated into the United States, whenever a Congress has thus extended the Constitution of the United States to that area and has made the inhabitants thereof citizens of the United States, the result has always been that a State or States have eventually been created out of that Territory. There are only two exceptions, namely, the Territory of Alaska and the Territory of Hawaii.

It is important to remember, Mr. President, that almost 100 years ago, namely, in 1854, a President of the United States, Franklin Pierce, who was a Democrat, authorized the negotiation of a treaty with the free government of Hawaii for the annexation of those islands to the United States; and in those negotiations President Franklin Pierce and those who carried on the negotiations made it clear that in their minds the eventual destiny of Hawaii, if annexed, would be that of statehood. So almost 100 years ago the first promise of statehood was extended to the people of Hawaii.

It is true that the treaty of annexation was not ratified at that time, but it is also true that only 14 years later, namely, in 1868, President Andrew Johnson sought to negotiate and did negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the government of Hawaii. Then, again, a President of the United States announced the purpose of annexation and of eventual statehood. It is not necessary to remind Members of the Senate, but I think it is important for the RECORD, to state that President Andrew Johnson, before he became Vice President of the United States, had been the military governor of Tennessee; and prior to that time he had sat in the Senate of the United States as a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

Many years passed—approximately 30 years after the treaty was negotiated by President Johnson—when, under the administration of President William McKinley, Hawaii was finally annexed to the United States and was incorporated into the United States. The Constitution was extended to Hawaii. Its people were made citizens of the United States; and again we held out the promise of eventual statehood. Exactly the same promise which was given in 1787 to the inhabitants of the Northwest Territory was given, by the annexation of Hawaii, under President McKinley, to the people of Hawaii.

Now the situation is such that in this Territory more than 93 percent of all the students in the schools of Hawaii are American citizens, but they are still denied the fulfillment of the promise extended to them over many decades by Congresses of the United States and by Presidents of the United States, namely, that the time would come when they would be admitted as a State into the Federal Union.

THE LOYALTY OF THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII

The population of Hawaii—approximately 500,000—is made up of some 24 or 25 percent of people of Caucausian blood or ancestry, approximately 33 or 34 percent of people of Japanese ancestry, and approximately 14 or 16 percent of people of Hawaiian blood. All are Americans in the great tradition of America.

During World War II a contingent of Japanese-American troops from Hawaii served under the command of Gen. Mark Clark throughout the Italian campaign. General Clark paid them the tribute that they were the most decorated battalion in American battle history. No one has successfully challenged the loyalty of the Japanese-Americans of Hawaii.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the able Senator from Wyoming, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is making a very fine contribution today relative to the statehood issue. I am only sorry that, because of attendance at committee meetings and for other reasons, not more Members of the Senate are present on the floor at this time, when the Senator from Wyoming is discussing the matter of statehood for these Territories.

As the able Senator well knows, Hawaii, if my recollection serves me correctly, has now been a Territory longer than any other Territory was required to be, save one, I believe; and today the population of Hawaii is larger than the population of any other Territory which was admitted to the Union as a State, with, I also believe, one exception or possibly two exceptions.

In terms of contributions to the Federal Treasury, the people of Hawaii today are contributing, in the form of taxes, more than 12 of the States of the Union now are contributing, I believe.

ECONOMIC FITNESS OF HAWAII

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the actual facts, as developed in the hearings held by our committee, show that the revenues of the Federal Government derived from the Territory of Hawaii amount to a greater sum than that

which come from each of 10 States. During the period of annexation—in other words, since the administration of President McKinley—the people of the Territory of Hawaii have contributed more than $1,000,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States. They have amply demonstrated their economic readiness for statehood—their ability to support it. They have demonstrated their political readiness for statehood. There is no reason why they should not have statehood. They are the outposts of America in the Pacific Ocean.

The denial of statehood to the people of Hawaii would be a blot upon the reputation of the Government of the United States, because it would repudiate the very principles the attainment of which we claim to be our objective. Surely we know and we want the world to know our purpose, namely, to hold aloft the lamp of liberty for all the peoples of all the world. In these times when we are seeking to win the minds of the peoples of Asia, when we are trying to overcome Communist propaganda which is representing Americans as imperialistic capitalists, seeking to dominate the world, it would be most helpful to have word go forth, by the admission of Hawaii to full equality in the American Union, that we mean what we say when we talk of self-government.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not mean to interrupt the able Senator in his remarks, but will he yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I welcome the interruption.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely rise to concur in what the Senator from Wyoming has said. I believe that it is of extreme importance to keep in mind that Hawaii, as a State, can do much to bring about a better understanding between the continental area of our country and the Far East, which I believe will hold an important place in determining the future destiny of the world.

I also wish to say to the able Senator from Wyoming that we, in California, who are closest to the Territory of Hawaii, from a geographic point of view, and who, perhaps for that reason, feel that we know her and her people better than do any of the other States of the Union, feel that Hawaii's period of apprenticeship for half a century is of ample length not only to justify her admission, but also to justify us in the belief that the date for her admission is long past due.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from California for his comments. I welcome them. I wish that many other Senators, who, I know, entertain the same views, would express their opinions as he has done, because the time is coming when we must raise this issue upon the Senate floor.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN SUPPORTS BILLS

The statehood bills have been passed over consistently on the call of the calendar, ever since they were reported, early in the session. They will continue to be passed over, and therefore it will become incumbent upon me, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to move that they be considered.

Only a week ago I called upon the President of the United States, who has recommended enactment of these statehood bills, to see whether there had been any change of mind on the part of the Executive with respect to the propriety of this action, and its desirability. I am glad to be authorized by the President to say that he has not changed his mind, and that he believes that Hawaii and Alaska should be admitted to the Union.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ALASKA

The Senator from California made a comment, in his all too limited remarks, about the dangers in the Pacific, and about the importance which that area holds in world affairs. It reminds me of the fact that Gen. "Billy" Mitchell, the pioneer of air power, the man who laid his military career upon the line and sacrificed it in order to allay objections of American military authorities to air power, stated that the nation which holds Alaska will control the world. When one studies a global map, not Mercator's projection, but a map which represents the earth, and looks down upon it from the North Pole, it becomes clear how important Alaska is in the geographic structure of the world.

Alaska is only 54 miles away from Siberia, across the Bering Strait. The one hundred and eightieth meridian is the international date line, as everyone knows. The one hundred and sixtieth meridian, a little bit farther to the east, passes through both Alaska and Hawaii, making it clear as one looks upon such a map that Alaska and Hawaii are the fingers of the hand of Uncle Sam in the Pacific. How marvelous it would be if, by granting statehood to these Territories, we make certain to the peoples of the Orient that that hand of Uncle Sam is holding the torch of liberty and peace to the peoples of the Asiatic world. That is what statehood means to me.

There can be no question, as I said a moment ago in response to the comments of the Senator from California, that Hawaii is clearly ready for statehood. It has been said that Alaska may not be ready. But Alaska is a great Territory, of broad expanse. Some 365,000,000 acres are contained within its boundaries. It is rich in timber. It is rich in waterpower. It is rich in minerals. What many people do not know is that the capital of Alaska, Juneau, is on a parallel of latitude comparable to that of the great cities of Scandinavia. Finland, Norway, Sweden, and parts of Denmark are in the same general area of latitude as Alaska. The opportunity is there waiting for the development of the wonderful natural resources which this Territory possesses, to build up a prosperous State.

People will not readily go to live in a Territory if thereby they sacrifice their full participation in the Government of the United States. Capital hesitates to go in, because capital does not desire to risk itself, so to speak, in a Territory where the full share of statehood and hence self-government is denied. Citizens who are voting in the United States dislike very much to move to a Territory even in search of development and wealth, when they know that they will sacrifice some of their full rights as citizens.

Statehood for Alaska would mean the greater use of Alaska's natural resources and the production of more wealth for the United States. It would mean the development of new bases for a sound economy. All the arguments which were presented to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee with respect to both these bills, seemed to a majority of the committee to sustain the contention that these last two remaining incorporated Territories of the United States should be granted full statehood.

OBJECTIONS ARE UNSUBSTANTIAL

Objection has been based upon arguments which, it seems to me, have no validity except in the fears of those who make them. The argument of noncontiguity is advanced against the admission of both Hawaii and Alaska. That argument was raised against the admission of California, when it was proposed that California should be made a State of the Union; and in those days, of course, California was noncontiguous, because it was separated from the rest of the United States by what many people, even Members of the United States Senate, such as Daniel Webster, thought was an impenetrable desert and a Rocky Mountain range which no one could surmount. How false those assumptions were, we now know; and we who are so familiar with the development of aviation know that this argument of noncontiguity has no rational basis.

Mr. President, the people of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are American citizens, and they were made American citizens by our voluntary act. They are loyal, they are able, they are intelligent; they have rendered excellent service to the people of the United States, and they are entitled to recognition.

The argument has been made that there are representatives of communism in Hawaii. There are. But there are representatives of communism in continental United States, as well. The people of Hawaii, by their own acts, have shown how to handle that threat. In the bill which is on the Senate calendar there is a provision, which I submitted and which the committee adopted unanimously, to the effect that any person who advocates the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, or any person who belongs to any organization that does so, shall be ineligible for any office of trust or profit within the new State. That provision was unanimously adopted by the constitutional convention of the Territory of Hawaii.

Alaska was purchased in 1867, during the administration of Abraham Lincoln. The Secretary of State at that time was William H. Seward, one of the greatest statesmen of his time. A few years later, in 1884, as I recall, Alaska was incorporated into the Union as a Territory, on exactly the same terms as were all other Territories previously incorporated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. While I have seen nothing to the effect that it is part of official Soviet propaganda, I was called on the telephone when I was last in California by a native Eskimo who had come down from Alaska. She had lived there during her lifetime, and said that a part of the propaganda of the local Communists in Alaska—and there are very few of them—was to the effect that Alaska once having been Russian territory, might in the not too distant future be returned to the "mother country". It seems to me that if any such propaganda is being spread, before it gains circulation elsewhere in the world we should definitely serve notice that Alaska is a part of the Union, a member of the sisterhood of States, and that no one should get any false ideas regarding the American position relative to Alaska.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy the Senator made that comment, because it is a fact that the Soviet Government has announced that the sale of Alaska to the United States in 1867 by the Imperial Government of Russia was beyond the powers of that government. I should not be at all surprised if the claim were officially made at some time that Alaska is still Russian territory. The best answer to that, the best barrier to any such propaganda, is, as the Senator says, the passage of these bills.

Mr. President, I rose merely to make comment upon the fact that the Boys' Nation, now sitting in Washington, has exhibited a great deal of interest in the two statehood bills, and that it is my intention, at the proper time—and that will be soon—to move upon the floor of the Senate that we proceed to their consideration.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should first like to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Wyoming on his very able address advocating the admission of Hawaii and Alaska into the Union as States. The Senator from Wyoming, of course, knows that I have supported that program for some time, and I have repeatedly expressed myself in that regard. I hope that when the bills come before the Senate for consideration I shall have an opportunity to say something in support of the program.

The Senator from Wyoming has made a very powerful and unanswerable case for the admission of the two Territories to the Union. I hope that will come about very soon, because I believe, as does the Senator from Wyoming, that it is a very serious matter, and that we should not delay further the admission of these two Territories into the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I very much welcome the statement of the Senator from Montana. I am very grateful, and his cooperation and support will be appreciated.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 259. An act to fix the responsibilities of the Disbursing Officer and of the Auditor of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 260. An act to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia;

S. 261. An act to amend section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902;

S. 262. An act to amend section 3 of an act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia, approved February 11, 1929, and for other purposes;

S. 263. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1904, as amended;

S. 488. An act to increase the fee of jurors in condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia;

S. 490. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia";

S. 492. An act to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare; and for other purposes;

S. 494. An act to provide for the appointment of a deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 573. An act 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; and

S. 673. An act to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have been interested for many years in the problems presented by the destructive floods in the Missouri River Basin. These recurring floods periodically create serious loss of life and destruction of property. The Missouri River rises in my State, and the people of Montana are deeply interested in finding a solution for these recurring flood disasters. I have repeatedly sponsored measures designed to control these floods and provide for the orderly development of the resources of that potentially rich area of our country.

The great flood which has been sweeping down the Missouri River and its tributaries during the past week has been resulting in untold disaster and ruin to hundreds of thousands of our citizens. It is without doubt one of the greatest catastrophes ever to strike our country. Damage to property already incurred is estimated in hundreds of millions of dollars. The loss of life and disruption of families constitutes a national calamity which cannot be estimated in money. Daily we are reading in the press terrifying accounts of this tragic disaster.

The old methods and programs to control these floods in the Missouri Valley which have been followed through the years have completely failed. Despite the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been spent in putting a corset of levees and revetments on these rivers, periodically the destruction grows worse. A United Press dispatch to the Washington Post on July 20 says:

> The approaching crest of the Missouri at St. Louis is the highest in 107 years. The Missouri River's worst flood surged on towards the Mississippi today, leaving many thousands of people homeless and financially ruined. The death toll stood at 39 from the great flood through Kansas and Missouri, creating damages in the billions of dollars.

Reading from the report prepared by the Chief of Army Engineers for the President on the floods in Kansas that are now receding, we find these astounding figures: Over a million acres of some of the richest agricultural land in America under water, with their crops completely destroyed. Over half a million people have been displaced from their homes. Major bridges and roads have been washed out. Over 16,000 head of livestock lost. The transportation system of the area has been entirely disrupted; the 12 trunkline railroads suffering a loss of 87,000 cars, and the industrial network of the State rendered a maze of twisted steel and debris.

Here is the record of man's failure, written for all of us to see. I am constrained to ask, How long must this go on? Will we continue to try the piecemeal methods of the past? Will we continue to allow the uncoordinated efforts and programs of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, both esteemed agencies with fine records of performance in their individual fields, to try to make a go of their so-called shotgun wedding and continue to parcel out uncoordinated and ineffective projects on the Missouri River and its tributaries? Mr. President, can we continue to permit these two great agencies to flounder and fail in the ultimate purpose of really providing a comprehensive and workable plan of flood control, irrigation, soil conservation, reforestation, and recreation—a program which will actually control the river and ultimately enrich this great land area so vital to the national ecenomy? Or will we take heed of the New York Times editorial of July 17, 1951, which says:

> One of the late President Roosevelt's dreams was of an "Authority" on each of our great river systems. The Tennessee Valley Authority had indeed indicated that Federal development of a river for multiple purposes could be made to operate successfully and on a democratic basis. If on the Tennessee, why not on other rivers? The Missouri River presented a tremendous challenge. The majesty of its dimensions was almost enough to overawe the planners. Yet it was never proposed that any one person or any one committee should sit down and redesign the Missouri Valley. What was needed, and what is still needed, is an agency—a Missouri River Authority—to reconcile a great variety of plans and purposes for dif-

ferent parts of the river and for different uses of the same parts of the river. The Pick-Sloan conglomeration, although it contains numerous worthy projects, is not and never was an over-all plan for the entire river. It resembles a jigsaw puzzle on which a number of well-meaning persons have worked.

The very vastness of the problem has brought into action various interested groups in one field or another. Opponents of public water power don't wish to see such power developed on the Missouri. Those who are pushing irrigation do not see eye to eye with those whose interests are in navigation or in down-river flood control. The sectional interests of a dozen States are involved. But it does seem that the terrible object lesson of this flood must lead to a more statesmanlike approach to this whole subject. It will never be enough merely to check floods at Kansas City or any other point. What is required is the beneficial use of an entire river running for many hundreds of miles through the very heart of America.

Here is power that can enrich the Nation if wisely used, and force that can cost it dearly if it is not controlled. We need statesmanship in this field as much as we do in international affairs.

Strangely enough, this great flood in the Missouri is not an unexpected tragedy. For half a century the control of this great river system has presented the most serious problem the Congress has been called upon to consider. Periodically these raging floods course down the Missouri and its tributaries, blighting, eroding, and destroying vast stretches of valuable agricultural lands. No one can fail to see that the future wealth and productivity of our country is threatened by these recurring conditions. Certainly we cannot afford to permit any selfish economic or political consideration to interfere with the sound solution of an issue which holds such tremendous consequences for the future of our country. It is universally recognized that the basic wealth of the United States comes from the ground. It consists of our vast expanses of rich agricultural lands, our extensive forests, our mineral deposits, our great system of rivers and potential electric power resources. These assets form the basis of all our boasted economic wealth and power, upon which we have grown to be the greatest industrial nation in the world.

Mr. President, the American people are the trustees of this great heritage. Acting through their Government, they have the sacred responsibility to preserve these riches for the benefit of the present and succeeding generations. Ways and means of meeting this great national problem have been occupying the attention of the Congress for a long time. Some years ago, I joined with a number of distinguished members of this body in presenting a bill to provide a unified, integrated program for the control of these floods and the development of the Missouri River system, but because of the pressure of powerful lobbies in Washington that measure has been ignored.

The great stumbling block seems to be power. If the Congress would surrender to the private power lobby and provide a program of river valley development under which all electric power developed would be delivered directly to the private utilities at the bus bars, the fight against proposed river authorities would end immediately. Such a program, of course, would be a complete abandonment of the public interest and the national welfare.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator knows, of course, that I have labored to effect the development of the St. Lawrence River. The statement he has just made reminds me that 3 or 4 years ago I received a letter from the president of one of the largest New England power companies which had been opposing the development of St. Lawrence power. The letter stated that if the proponents of the St. Lawrence development would agree that all the power from the St. Lawrence should be sold to the power companies at the bus bar and none of it sold direct to the REA's or the municipal plants, that the power interests, the ones he was representing—and I feel that he was speaking for all of them—would not only withdraw their opposition to the development of St. Lawrence power but would get behind it and would help us put it over.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his observations. I agree completely with his statement of the situation. I think it is absolutely true, as he indicates, that the opposition to these programs is really based on power.

That has been my understanding of the situation for a long time. Of course, to take such action as is suggested, to turn the power developed by these great dams over to the power interests at the bus bars, would be a complete abandonment of the obligations of the Congress to the people and to the welfare of our country.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, the Senator realizes that the great financial interests of New York and Boston, who are really the hard core of the opposition to the development of our natural resources, not only on the St. Lawrence but in the Missouri Valley and elsewhere, oppose these projects on the ground that we cannot afford the public expenditures; yet they are perfectly willing that any amount of public money shall be appropriated for these expenditures if the product is turned over to their exclusive use after the money has been spent.

While the Senator from Montana was absent from the country, there was, a few days ago, a considerable furor over the release of figures showing the number of a certain type of bomber which our Air Force has available for use. It was a pitifully inadequate force, to be sure. It is charged that certain members of a congressional committee by releasing the figures gave useful information to any potential enemy nation. However, it is also true that the power situation in this country is every bit as critical as the situation of our Air Force.

It is so critical that although the Defense Production Authority gave me the figures, they asked me not to release them because they are labeled "top secret." The condition in that respect is just as critical as the condition of our Air Force. Yet I am shocked to hear people who deplore the pitiful condition and the inadequacy of our Air Force exerting all the influence of which they are capable to prevent the development of further power in this country, which would go a long way toward correcting the inadequacy of the Air Force.

We are today paying some 6 or 7 cents a pound more for aluminum than the market price for aluminum produced at Massena, N. Y., on the banks of the St. Lawrence River, because it is necessary to generate power from steam three or four hundred miles aways and transmit it to the very banks of the St. Lawrence, to the site of the proposed dam. That is contributing to inflation, I may add also.

I wonder how long we shall have to put up with such conditions. The House Committee on Public Works is even now considering a bill which would provide for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, and the power project. It is amazing to learn that there is doubt as to whether or not that committee will give a favorable report on the bill. I understand that it depends upon one or two votes in the committee. It is inconceivable to me that any group of men, knowing the great need of this country for power and navigation which this development would provide, should hesitate for a moment to give their stamp of approval to this great project.

Yesterday I read in the newspaper that it appears that Canada may have to go along alone and develop the waterway so that ships from the heart of North America may carry their produce to the far corners of the world, and that iron ore, so vital to the continuation of the great steel industry of the Midwest, may be brought in from Labrador to keep the great steel centers in operation. I do not see how any railroad president, such as the president of the Santa Fe Railroad, who I understand has been doing a big business in lobbying against the St. Lawrence seaway, or the Boston or New York bankers, or the heads of the utility interests, can go out and work against the interests of the country, and then go to bed and sleep. I do not see how they can do it, but they are doing it. I do not know whether they sleep or not, but I certainly know that they are lobbying. Their activities are actually worse today than they were during the years when their conduct resulted in the Federal Trade Commission's investigation of 1931, which I think the Senator from Montana will remember. It revealed the shocking tactics that they were using then. They are using all the same reprehensible tactics today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield so that I may ask the Senator from Vermont a question?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Vermont agree with me that in the atomic age in which we are living, with the serious threat to the security of our country ever present, it is important that we do everything we can in the years immediately ahead to develop facilities for the generation of every kilowatt of

electric power possible in order to make ourselves more secure?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. As I understand, we have recently contributed an enormous sum, through tax deductions and certain other measures, toward the construction of steam plants to generate power at a cost greatly exceeding the cost of our great hydroelectric developments, if they could once be constructed. For example, St. Lawrence power and Niagara power represent the lowest cost hydroelectric power anywhere in the United States, so far as I know. The cost is somewhere between 1 and 2 mills per kilowatt-hour for developing it at the bus bar. Yet it is unbelievable that these selfish interests—and I say again that they are located primarily in New York and Boston—should be working against the security of the United States. I do not care from what part of the country the opposition comes. It is inspired from these financial centers. I could give the names of the persons who I think inspire it, if I thought it would do any good. I suppose they think that they are good patriotic American citizens when they are trying to obstruct the strengthening of the security of the Nation. I give them what little credit I can, by believing that they think they are doing the right thing. They probably think it is right that a few of them should control the destiny of the country, and that it is not safe in the hands of the people. I do not agree with them, however.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true also that the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway, with the power facilities inherent in it, would greatly increase the power resources of that section of the country?

Mr. AIKEN. It certainly would. We have not the power now to recover the sulfur which goes to waste from our Vermont copper mines. We have not the power to produce the maximum amount of copper. We have not the power to recover the pure iron which is going to waste. We have not the power to fully operate the asbestos mines at reasonable cost. We have not the power to develop titanium in northern New York. We have not power enough to develop manganese in Maine. Yet these so-called patriots say that it is better not to have these things done than it is to take any chances with the profits which they now make from their business, the policy of which is high prices and scarcity.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit a third question, is it not also true that the type of a third world war, if, unfortunately, we become involved in one, will be such that we can expect that great damage will be done to the transportation facilities of our country, and that therefore we shall need to have available to us every possible avenue for transportation in order to meet our internal emergency problems as they arise during the course of the bombings?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct again. We learned during World War II that although we could successfully bomb the German railroads, so that they could not function, we could not effectively bomb the waterways. Even today Russia is putting every effort into the development of the Dnieper, the Volga, and other rivers in Russia, constructing thousands of miles of waterways and putting in power developments which will eventually dwarf our own if we do not speed up.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that if we do the job we are capable of doing in expanding our great capitalistic system—and I am one of those who have always said that we have only scratched the surface of the expansion possibilities of our economy—there will still be plenty of work and business for the railroads to do without their trying to prevent the construction of some new waterways?

Mr. AIKEN. The development of large blocks of power in this country would greatly increase the amount of freight which the railroads would have to carry. The type of freight which it is proposed to carry on the St. Lawrence waterway is the type of freight which would never use the railroads. It could not use rails and stay in the competitive field. For example, 2 or 3 years ago I was in the city of Duluth watching the ore carriers come in there and load with 10,000 tons of ore and leave in 3 or 4 hours. At that time the rail rate from Duluth to the steel centers of the Great Lakes was $8 a ton on the ore. The water rate was 80 cents. There are certain types of ore which must have water transportation, or the area which is most concerned cannot remain in the competitive field. Those nations which do not keep up cannot remain in the competitive field either.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close my examination of the Senator from Vermont with this comment to both the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Montana. I am not at all surprised to see both of them on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, as they have on a great many occasions in the past, pressing forward in support of a program which would benefit all the people of the United States, in contrast with projects which would simply benefit a selfish few, who seem to want to take advantage of all the people of the country. In my opinion, much of the opposition to this greatly needed wealth-creating project, the St. Lawrence waterway, comes from people who want to protect their selfish interests and who forget that one of the great tests of patriotism and liberalism is whether or not one desires to promote the things which try to spread the greatest amount of good to the greatest number of people.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Vermont for their very valuable contributions to this discussion. I am fully in accord with their views. I am satisfied that when we come to consider this legislation which I am proposing they will assist in its enactment. In the past I have observed the splendid efforts on the part of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in connection with the St. Lawrence waterway. I also wish to congratulate the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his very able remarks. I agree with both Senators that the interests which are opposing the development of power, except when they can control it, have already worked a great damage and injury to our country. We would have had much power developed in the country at the beginning of World War II to meet the requirements of war production if we had been permitted to go ahead with our hydroelectric-power programs.

During the war it became necessary to develop the chrome deposits in Montana. However, we had to ship the raw ore all the way from Montana to Niagara Falls and Pittsburgh, because we did not have any power in our State at that time to process it.

I hope that as the result of the efforts we are making now we shall be able to develop in Montana the much needed electric power that will enable us to proceed with the development and utilization of the valuable chrome deposits and also to expand the production of manganese in our State through the utilization of lower-grade manganese, made possible through cheap electricity. I am very grateful to the Senators for their constructive remarks.

In the face of all these conditions which I have recited I am confident that there exists in this body such a degree of patriotism and devotion to the welfare of our country that we will be prompted to put aside all special-interest pressures, all political or partisan considerations, and go forward with a genuine desire to solve this issue which means so much not only to the area involved but to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I will send to the desk a bill sponsored by a group of distinguished Members of this body, to provide a program for the control of floods in the Missouri River and its tributaries, and for the unified and balanced development of the resources potentialities of the Missouri River Basin. This measure, as I have already indicated, is not a new proposal. Similar proposals have been presented to the Congress in previous sessions. It has been the basis of widespread study and discussion over the years. It has been endorsed by some of the leading newspapers of the Nation. For a number of years the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which is located in the center of this disaster area, has been giving this proposal careful study and has repeatedly endorsed it as the only real solution of this vexing problem. It is a solution which is absolutely essential to the economic welfare of the whole Nation.

Mr. President, this bill for the unified and balanced development of all the resources potentialities of the Missouri Basin will provide the foundation upon which a virile American free-enterprise system can expand and develop with an assured future. It will create great new wealth, attract new populations, raise the standard of living.

For example, let us consider the fact that in my State of Montana we have a population of only 550,000. Over the years it has lost population. We had as many people in Montana 30 years ago as we have today. The reason for the failure to grow is the lack of development

of the resources of our State. If we had been permitted to develop our power resources, our mineral resources, and other resources, we would have a much greater population and prosperity in Montana today.

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

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Montana agree with me that one of the reasons that Montana has not been able to develop its power resources to the extent the Senator would like to see them developed is that there are in Montana some private power utility forces which, in the first place, oppose the construction of great Federal power and flood-control dams and, in the second place, when they cannot stop the construction of great Federal power and flood-control dams they do all they can to control the dams, by trying to get Congress, over the years, by various subterfuges and devious means, in various pieces of legislation, to give them control of the power at the bus bar? Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Montana, if he will permit me to do so, that when I think of anyone who really symbolizes in America the people's interests in regard to the fight which constantly goes on in the Senate to protect and preserve the dams for the use of the people, instead of for the use of private utilities of the country, I think of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I wish here and now to extend to him my sincere compliments and congratulations for the great fight he has made over the years on the floor of the Senate against the private utilities which are trying to monopolize the dams by seeking various phases or degrees of bus-bar control.

I should like to ask the Senator from Montana if he does not feel, as one of those who have stood for the people's interests in regard to these dams and have fought the private utilities in their attempts to grab the dams for their selfish and greedy interests, that in this session of Congress, probably more than in any other recent session of Congress, the private utilities, lobbies have been having their way to a degree which is not in the interest of the American people?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Oregon is correct. During the last several years, whenever we had such programs up for consideration on the floor of the Senate we found a very powerful lobby working against us and preventing us from establishing those transmission lines which are so essential to getting the power out to the load centers, where it would serve the farmers and also make it possible to develop new enterprises.

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

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator's comment about transmission lines leads me to make one further comment. I see on the floor of the Senate the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I wish to say that it is of great personal pride to me that I have always found myself associated with the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Washington in the fight for what we call the grid-back transmission lines. In view of some of the indications of attitude in the Senate of the United States in this session of Congress, I believe the people of our Pacific Northwest ought to have this word of warning given to them today in regard to the future power development in our section of the country, about one of which the Senator from Montana is speaking this afternoon: They will have to maintain a constant vigilance at the voting boxes if they are to have grid backs in the way of transmission lines built from the people's dams to the load centers, so that fair and reasonable contracts may be entered into with respect to the current from the federally owned grid-back transmission lines; otherwise, it will be most difficult to prevent these dams from becoming the pawns of the private utilities of America. Does the Senator think I am right or wrong?

Mr. MURRAY. I think the Senator is perfectly right. In my State of Montana, we have made some progress as a result of the fact that the Electric Bond and Share Holding Co. has been separated from domination of the Montana Power Co. We are finding now a better spirit on the part of the Montana Power Co. in connection with these projects and development of industry.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes; we have made some progress. However, not so long ago the Senator observed on the floor the loss we suffered in regard to the Southwestern Power issue, did he not?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator agree with me that that particular matter symbolizes a great danger to the future building of grid-back transmission lines by the Federal Government in connection with federally built dams?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. That is a very, very important matter, about which, as the Senator says, we must be on the alert when these matters come before the Senate.

The trouble is that we never get a chance to offset much of the propaganda and pressure that are brought to bear in the country. It seems to me that a great deal of money is being spent by the big power interests to deceive the people.

Mr. MORSE. They know how to spend money in campaign time against those who will not go along with them, do they not?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; that is certainly true.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask the Senator from Montana this question: Does he agree with me that if the taxpayers of the United States as a whole are going to spend the millions upon millions of dollars which are required for the building of one of these multiple-purpose dams, it then becomes the duty of the Congress to see to it that the dam is administered in a manner which does not result in its being turned over to the private utilities, for the selfish, private gain of the private utilities and of the administrators who control them?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. To permit such a result would be an abandonment of our obligations to the people and to the country. It seems to me that what the Senator has been saying is absolutely correct.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NIXON in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to my able friend from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed that the Senator from Oregon stated that the utility companies know how to spend money at campaign time against those who do not do their bidding. Let me add that they know how to spend money between campaigns as well. I do not believe there is a congressional district in the United States—certainly not in my part of the country—where the utility companies do not have year-round employees who travel through those districts, building up those whom they would support.

Mr. MORSE. Public relations experts.

Mr. AIKEN. And they are tearing down those whom they would destroy, and are charging all of the expense to the consumers, by putting it on their light bills.

Mr. MORSE. In the form of public relations experts.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Some years ago there was in the State of Oregon a concern that busied itself with writing boilerplate articles for the public utilities. Those articles were reprinted all over the United States by those newspapers that would use them.

Let me add that I do not know where those articles are coming from now but the boilerplate editorial writer of the utility companies is in business again, and I have seen identical editorials in newspapers hundreds of miles removed from one another, all decrying the development of public power, except as it may be turned over to the private utility interests, and none of them having anything good to say about those who believe that the people themselves should own these great power developments, but doing everything possible to discredit such great agencies as the REA, the TVA, Bonneville Power, Grand Coulee, and others of that nature.

Today they are at it again. As I said a few minutes ago, they are at it worse than they were in the years before my esteemed constituent, Bob Healy, at that time Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, made his great investigation which resulted in putting before the people of the United States the situation as it existed at that time.

Today those same persons probably are more brazen and feel more sure of themselves and of their influence, both in the Congress and in the executive branch of the Government, than they have in years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question, through the Senator from Montana, if he will permit.

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. In fact, I should like to ask two questions.

The Senator from Vermont has referred to the fact that the private utilities by means of their lobbying practices are more brazen now than he has seen them be for many years. Does the Senator think that perhaps the cause of their activities at this session of Congress is that they think the elections of 1950 have given them a great opportunity to work against the interests of the people?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know. I think they would work against the interests of the people, anyway. I think they are very short-sighted. I think they are determined to control the natural resources of this country, and I think they have been making great progress in the past few months, as I have said, both on the Hill and downtown.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think they are satisfied with some of the results they had in the 1950 elections?

Mr. AIKEN. I think so. On the other hand, they are dissatisfied, I think, with some of the other results, too.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, undoubtedly so; undoubtedly they are dissatisfied with some of the results.

In regard to the REA matter, which the Senator mentioned, does the Senator from Vermont think that the farmers of the country, by and large, who now are living on electrified farms, would be living on electrified farms if they had had to wait for the private utilities to take the transmission lines to their farms?

Mr. AIKEN. That is a matter of history, namely, that the private utility companies said the rural areas of this country never would pay, and that they never could extend their lines into them. The farm people of this country, who now quite generally are supplied with electricity, would still be doing their milking by hand if it had not been for the REA.

I wish to add that the members of the REA and some officials of the REA are getting altogether too complacent. They have the power, and they are resting on their laurels. However, they must awake to the situation, or else some day they will find that their lines have been turned over to others.

Mr. MORSE. They must recognize that, after all, there must be no stopping in the constant job of protecting the interests of the people against those who would invade and would encroach upon the public interest.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. If the REA is worth fighting to create, it is worth fighting to keep and to preserve.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that we simply could not build multiple-purpose dams, not only in regard to the reclamation features and the flood-control features, but also in regard to the electric-power features, if we had to look to the private utilities to build them? Is that so?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; that is entirely true.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me add, if the Senator will permit, that that was not entirely true until all the private utilities came under the power and control of the holding companies, administered in many cases from New York City; and it would not be true today if the local utilities could get free from those holding companies, which have a grip around their necks which they cannot break. In my own State we have one distribution system which has been bled white twice by a holding company. Just last year it again shed its last drop of blood. I certainly hope that as it continues operations, it will be free from the throttlehold which the Boston utility interests have had over it during the past years, and have kept over it until they bled it of every drop of blood it had.

Of course, the preferred stockholders take the licking.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will permit, let me say that I am particularly glad he has raised the issue which he has raised today, so that in the colloquy among the three of us, we could make the record we have made because, as one who believes in the legitimate rights of the private utilities—and I have fought to protect the legitimate rights of the private utility—I have taken the position that a bus-bar monopoly is no legitimate right of a private utility on a dam built with the taxpayers' money. As one who believes in protecting the legitimate rights of private utilities, I ask the Senator from Montana this question: Does he agree with me that when grid-back transmission-line systems are built, it is then true under our private-property economy that the private utilities in turn are entitled to protection from discrimination on the part of bureaucrats and administrators of Government, who deny to them, for arbitrary and capricious reasons, reasonable contracts for power with which to serve their subscribers in those sections and regions which prefer to be served by the private utility rather than by a public-utility district?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is absolutely correct. In my State of Montana, one of the first things which was done, after the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam was underway, was to make a contract with the local power company, and give them access to the power which would result from that plant, upon a fair basis, and for the purpose of enabling them to serve a community, where there was going to be great need for this additional power. So I believe that the local power companies will be given fair treatment, the same as any other citizens or individuals in the country. They are entitled to it, of course, as a matter of the operation of our American system.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to join in the expression that private utility systems should have every fair chance to serve the communities, and not be subject to unfair competition from public power; but I feel that the chances of reaching fair agreements with the private utility systems is not rosy, so long as those local systems are controlled by distant holding companies which have not the slightest interest in the communities they serve, their only interest being in what they can get out of it.

I referred to the small distribution system in Vermont, a $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 system. I am satisfied that if that small power company were on its own and could deal directly with the people of its community, there would be no trouble at all in securing fair treatment; but, so long as it has been controlled by interests in Boston, and formerly in New York, interests whose only concern in the community was to get as much as possible from it, it was then impossible either for the public to be served adequately or for the subsidiary utility company, itself, to long exist.

Mr. MURRAY. I think it is absolutely true that, where the small power companies get out from under the control or domination of big holding concerns, they tend to work more cooperatively in the community and try to help work out a solution of our problems.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I would refer back to the proposed St. Lawrence development. It has always been expected that from 80 to 90 percent of the power developed on the St. Lawrence River would be distributed to existing private systems; but having 80 to 90 percent of that power to distribute has not been satisfactory to them. They want it all. They want a complete monopoly, and they are exerting every possible effort, regardless of public necessity and national security to prevent the development of the St. Lawrence and Niagara power, over 4,000,000 horsepower, unless they control all of it.

Mr. MURRAY. I certainly appreciate the various appropriate comments of the Senator from Vermont and his valuable contributions to this discussion today.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the able Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was, of course, very much interested in the discussion. As the Senator from Montana well knows, what he is trying to do now is what we of the Pacific Northwest have been trying to do for some time. But, as an example of what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has said about how vigilant we must be in this matter, and to show that the private power interests never quit working, but are working all the time, during campaigns and between campaigns, I may say that, while the Senator from Montana was absent on official business, a proposal was introduced before the House Ways and Means Committee in the form of a tax bill, the purpose of which was to tax the distribution of electric energy by public bodies 3½ percent. It was approved by the committee, and only when we called attention to the fact that the amendment was sponsored by Mr. Smith and his private-power lobby in Washington did the committee reconsider the matter and reject the proposal. Of course, obvi-

ously, such a tax would kill the distribution of electric energy by municipal bodies, by making their bonds too high for purposes of financing; but it was simply another move on the part of private utilities. As Mr. Smith put it in a letter, it was a small foot in a big door. They never quit. So it is good to those of us who have been in this fight for many years to find the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Oregon going into the matter again at this time. We cannot cease our fight to develop the great hydroelectric resources of the country.

Mr. MURRAY. I want to assure all the Senators who have participated in this discussion today that I greatly appreciate the help they gave me a few years ago when we were fighting for the Hungry Horse Dam and the transmission lines in our State. As a result of our success in that fight, we today are bringing into our State several big industries. We are to have an aluminum plant, we are to have a ferrochrome plant, and a chemical plant is already in operation. We are expending manganese production in our State. Other industries will no doubt follow. So I may say that all of that has come as a result of the fine support which the Senators who are here contributing to this discussion today, have given it; and which I greatly appreciate.

The bill which I am presenting, if enacted, will do much to stabilize our economy at full employment, full use of resources levels, which alone will satisfy our people. Here is the effective and silencing answer to those false prophets who would create despair of our future, and spread the deadening blight of communistic dissension amongst us. Here is something big, worth working together to accomplish.

This great program for the unified and rapid development of the resources of the Missouri Basin will cost much money. But this sum will not be required, nor can it be invested, all at once. The program will start small, and will develop gradually. But not a single dollar of the amount needed is a charge on the taxpayers of this Nation, to be consumed without return. On the contrary, this is a capital investment; and even before the heavier amounts are required for the larger projects contemplated, returns on that investment will appear.

Mr. President, unless the Missouri Valley Authority is enacted into law and implemented at once, the losses I have described will continue to occur with every seasonal flood or drought. I say this because no adequate measures thus far have been taken, or contemplated in any plans now before this Congress, to prevent such destruction. On the contrary, we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in diking the river, strait-jacketing it in levees that do little more than narrow its channel and add to its destructive force.

Throughout this proposed legislation runs one guiding principle, one which it is not possible to obtain under any other methods so far advanced to meet the Missouri Valley situation. Where there is one river system, having different problems over its course, conflicting claims upon its waters, and freighted with so many separate desires and hopes of the people, there must be one center of responsibility, one authority, acting under principles of equity, in touch with and guided by the interest and welfare of all sections, and acting, also, only after securing the best advice obtainable from all groups and sections in the area. This principle has been tried out in the TVA, and has proven sound. It is the democratic way to find a solution for a complex problem which is vexed by conflicting interests and demands. The people will always have a check on the program because it can continue and its plans can be put into effect only as a result of annual appropriations.

Mr. President, the persistent need for this legislation as the only way to secure an adequate and unified program for the control of the river and development of the valley has become quite evident to those Government agencies which, over the years, have had independent administrative responsibility for parts of this program. I refer to the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, where those responsible for policy in both Departments are on record as favoring the MVA to overcome the shortcomings of the piecemeal approaches they are now forced to apply. They favor it because they know that none of their accumulated wisdom and none of their technical ability will be lost and none of their current program will be cast aside by the establishment of the MVA. These Departments of our Government, which have brought great credit and renown to our country, know that an MVA will furnish a medium through which, in collaboration with each other, they can achieve ever greater beneficial results for the Nation.

Mr. President, on my own behalf, and on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I send to the desk the bill which I have been discussing, a bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes. I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1883) to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. MAGNUSON), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee of Public Works.

NATURAL GAS AND STATES' RIGHTS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in the famous case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 399) Chief Justice John Marshall said:

> No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States, and of compounding the American people into one common mass.

Obviously, John Marshall did not foresee the vast centralization of power in Washington which has taken place within the past 20 years. He was unable to visualize the passion for power which possesses the heads of some Federal departments and agencies. Certainly John Marshall did not believe that the Federal Government would ever attempt to usurp the jurisdiction of the States, utilizing a national emergency to justify such action. In short, John Marshall was happily unaware of the type of political dreamer who struts today under the Fair Deal label.

These observations seem particularly appropriate in this present period of national emergency. In the past year the administration has frequently tried to use the defense effort as an excuse for obliterating the lines which separate national and State authority. The plan of the Department of Interior to limit the use of natural gas is typical of the administration's employment of the present emergency as an excuse to whittle away at the sovereignty of the States. The Interior Department's plan to regulate and to limit the use of natural gas is perhaps the best example of this power-grabbing propensity because the issues are simple and unclouded by other considerations.

First, we may concede that the Secretary of the Interior has the technical legal right to regulate the use of natural gas even in intrastate commerce. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 gives the President absolute power to allocate scarce materials in the interest of national defense. The President's delegation of the power to allocate natural gas to the Secretary of the Interior was perfectly legal. The action, therefore, which is proposed by the Department's Petroleum Administration for Defense does not involve issues of legal power. However, the Congress never expected the Federal Government to use the Defense Production Act to duplicate or to supplant regulation of a subject which the States have heretofore handled in a highly competent manner.

Mr. President, much of the confusion at the present time as to the shortages of gas experienced in many parts of the country has been brought about by the Department which now seeks to control the supply. Throughout the Central West, natural gas has been used for many years in the heating of homes, and it is almost essential both to our industry and to the civilian population.

The second point to bear in mind is that shortages of natural gas either exist or are imminent in some localities. To the best of my knowledge, no one denies that the present emergency will result in shortages of natural gas which require governmental action. The plan of the Interior Department to assume control over the use of natural gas presents a simple, clear-cut issue. Who is better qualified to determine the existence of a shortage in the supply of natural gas—Secretary Chapman or the State public utility commissions? Who is better qualified to determine when prohibitions on the use of natural gas should be terminated? Can regulation of the use of natural gas be handled more economically by Secretary Chapman or by State regulatory agencies?

The answers to these questions are obvious to all those who are even slightly acquainted with the work of the public utility commissions of the several States. The initial announcement of the Petroleum Administration for Defense was generally interpreted to mean that the sale of gas for industrial use and for home heating would be controlled in the whole area east of the Mississippi River. In response to the storm of protest which greeted this announcement, Secretary Chapman said in a press release of July 10, 1951:

> In consultation with industry, PAD is currently assessing the whole situation with a view to drafting a restriction that will apply only to those areas in which it appears that gas shortages in varying degrees of severity may occur.

Regulations designed to meet natural gas shortages cannot be applied equitably in areas defined by Secretary Chapman. They cannot be administered fairly or efficiently on an area or regional basis, or even on a State-wide basis. In my home State of Ohio, for example, Toledo may experience a shortage of natural gas at a time when the supply in Cincinnati and Cleveland is ample to satisfy all demands for service. The Ohio Public Utilities Commission has been limiting the use of natural gas in some areas of my State ever since the close of World War II. The regulatory commissions of other States are either already limiting the use of natural gas, or have ample powers to combat impending shortages. The argument that Secretary Chapman, sitting here in Washington or campaigning in the West, is better qualified than the State public utilities commissions to limit the use of natural gas is utterly fantastic. Some of the problems involved are, first, determining which cities in a particular State have shortages which require limitation orders; second, determining when restrictions on the use of natural gas should be released or terminated; and third, deciding what type of regulation will meet the shortage in a particular community with a minimum of inconvenience to business, labor, and the residents of that community. All these problems are essentially local in character. They fall within the province of State regulation. The States have demonstrated their ability in this field.

It can hardly be contended that this proposed regulation by the Interior Department would be economical. The Federal regulation would duplicate that now being exercised by the States. As in all cases of dual and overlapping regulation, conflicts between Federal and State orders would result in wasted effort and extensive litigation. Moreover, the Department of the Interior has had no experience in the field of regulation which it intends now to invade. The action proposed by the Department serves only one purpose. It will permit new Federal jobs to be created and to be filled, most likely, on the basis of political and partisan considerations.

The distributors of natural gas should not be subjected to the burden of complying with unnecessary and conflicting regulations. Nevertheless, gas companies are not the only interested parties in this controversy. If regulations promulgated in Washington are too drastic, thousands of employees in the gas appliance industry, in industries dependent on natural gas, and in the home-building industry will suffer unemployment which is inevitable as the result of such regulation. If the regulations of the Petroleum Administration for Defense are not tight enough, users of natural gas, industrial and domestic, will suffer great hardship, particularly during the winter period.

Last Friday the House of Representatives approved an amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950 offered by Representative Bow, of Ohio. The Bow amendment would prevent the Federal Government from placing any restrictions on natural-gas use in States where the regulatory body of the State is exercising its authority over supply.

I hope the Senate conferees on the bill to amend the Defense Production Act will accept the Bow amendment. In my judgment, the Senate would have approved a comparable amendment had it been aware of Secretary Chapman's proposed regulation at the time when S. 1397 was being debated. A similar encroachment on State authority was contemplated in a provision of the administration bill designed to give the OPS authority to intervene in public utility rate cases all over the United States. The amendment proposed by the administration was defeated in the Banking and Currency Committee.

Adoption of the Bow amendment would serve as a warning to Secretary Chapman that the Congress, at least, still respects the rights of the States. If Secretary Chapman chooses to ignore this warning, Congress is not powerless. It can adopt what is in my judgment an eminently sound principle, namely, that any Federal official who refuses to allow State governments to play their legitimate role in the defense effort should himself be divested of all functions related to the Nation's preparedness program.

We must never forget, Mr. President, that State and local governments are not outmoded. Being closer to the people, they afford a much more intimate knowledge of, and participation in, representative government than would be the case if all power were centered in Washington. For the same reason, they can act more quickly and more efficiently in response to local needs. Finally, our State and local governments serve as workshops for political experimentation. They are not, of course, infallible—and Washington is far from it. However, the mistakes of one State or group of States can be avoided by the others. When the Federal Government takes action which is unwise, and it is doing so constantly, errors are compounded on a national basis. Apart from any considerations of legal power, the Federal Government should refrain from engaging in any activity which can be more effectively performed at a lower level of government.

I am very proud, Mr. President, that no one has ever accused me of being the type of "political dreamer" referred to by Chief Justice John Marshall in McCulloch against Maryland.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 24, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 23 (legislative day of June 27), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Claude Henry Chorpening, O12088, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and as brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 11, National Defense Act, as amended, and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 23 (legislative day of June 27), 1951:

POSTMASTER

Mrs. Rufina W. Gully, Gholson, Miss.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 23, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Bob Jones, Sr., founder of Bob Jones University, Greenville, S. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that Thou "hast made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth"; but help us not to forget that

Thou "hast determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation."

We thank Thee that we live in a country where we may be Jews or Gentiles, Catholics or Protestants, Christians or infidels, and no one has any governmental right to persecute us for what we believe; but we thank Thee that we do have the constitutional right to convert each other to our way of thinking as long as we do it by argument or persuasion.

We thank Thee for the personal liberties we enjoy, but help us to remember that every citizen's personal liberty ends where another citizen's personal liberty begins.

May we never forget that "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people"; so save us from a tolerant attitude toward a gangster underworld and protect us from weakness and corruption in high places that make underworld gangsterism possible.

May we, in our effort to bring peace to the world, not sacrifice the permanent on the altar of the immediate by sacrificing principle on the altar of convenience.

May these Thy servants serve under the directive will rather than under the permissive will of God.

Forgive us our individual and national sins, and bring to the hearts of all of our people a real sense of their need of God. We pray in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 20, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, why Look magazine, a magazine of Nation-wide circulation, would waste its valuable space in publishing so sorry and worthless an article as that of Professor Rodell about the Supreme Court is something I cannot understand. I do not know Professor Rodell, but I sincerely suspect that he belongs to the group which has brought down upon the world the distress from which mankind suffers and which we are now combating in Korea. To have named four members of this Court and charged them with incompetence, indolence, and irresponsibility is an insult to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I shall later make appropriate answer to this cheap and villainous slanderer.

THE LATE ADMIRAL FORREST P. SHERMAN

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Admiral Forrest P. Sherman met his death suddenly in line of duty. At the time, he was on an important mission overseas designed to further the defense of the United States, his final task in a life devoted to the service of his country.

Admiral Sherman's premature death comes as a shock to the entire Nation; it is especially a hard blow to those of us in the Congress who have grown to respect and value his great abilities as a naval leader.

Hardly more than 18 months ago, Admiral Sherman assumed command of the Navy as the Chief of Naval Operations. He took over at a critical time following the B-36 investigation and the dismissal of his predecessor, when Navy morale was at a low ebb and strong leadership was badly needed. Admiral Sherman furnished this leadership, together with a brilliant mind, strong character, and great all-around ability. The results of his leadership are evident in the high morale, efficiency, and readiness to fight of the Navy today.

In the early postwar years, when the armed services were split wide apart on the unification issue, Admiral Sherman, then a Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, was one of the framers of a workable unification structure. Because of his great capacity, he was always willing to assume additional tasks and responsibilities in the interest of a stronger national defense. He was on a special assignment, as the agent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when his death occurred. I fear that these additional tasks, eagerly assumed, may have hastened his untimely passing. But he died as he lived, worked, and fought—brave and forthright, with the needs of his country always foremost.

Admiral Sherman served with heroism in the Pacific during World War II as commanding officer of the aircraft carrier *Wasp* and in other important assignments. He survived wounds received in battle in 1942, but his passing yesterday was as much a hero's death as if it had occurred in battle.

Admiral Sherman's death in these critical times is a severe loss to the Nation and especially to the Navy which he served for 37 years. But because of his leadership and guidance, and his life of unstinting service, he has left the Navy well prepared and ready to meet whatever challenge it may face. In its future tasks the Navy will no longer have the presence of Admiral Sherman at the helm, but the tangible results of his work and his spirit and splendid example remain to guide its future leaders.

I deeply mourn the passing of one of the great naval leaders of all times. He was my personal friend. I will greatly miss his wise counsel, advice, and friendship.

The Armed Services Committee as well as the entire House of Representatives extend to Admiral Sherman's bereaved family their deepest sympathy.

Born in Merrimack, N. H., in 1896, and later a resident of Massachusetts, Admiral Sherman graduated from the Naval Academy in 1917, second in his class. During World War I he served on board the U. S. S. *Nashville* in the Mediterranean. Following that war he served at sea until 1922 when, after receiving flight training, he was designated a naval aviator, a designation he retained until his death. He served in various billets ashore and afloat, advancing in rank to captain in 1942 when he was ordered to command the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Wasp*. As commanding officer of the *Wasp* he participated in the Solomons campaign in the Pacific and was awarded the Navy Cross. His ship later was sunk in battle but not until after it had inflicted great damage on the enemy. Admiral Sherman was wounded in combat, but recovered to serve brilliantly in the Pacific during the remainder of the war on the staffs of Admirals Towers and Nimitz, and was promoted to rear admiral and awarded both the Legion of Merit and the Distinguished Service Medal for this service.

Following World War II, Admiral Sherman served under Admiral Nimitz as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, with the rank of vice admiral. During this period he participated, as the Navy's representative, in the unification conferences which resulted a successful unification structure for the armed services. From January 1948 until November 1949, Admiral Sherman served as commander, United States Naval Forces, Mediterranean, commanding a large carrier task force, and became the Nation's foremost military expert on that area.

On November 2, 1949, Admiral Sherman was sworn in as Chief of Naval Operations for a 4-year term. It is in this assignment that most of us here in the Congress have known him as a courageous, able leader, as the man who reunited the Navy and built it up to the strong fighting force it is today.

Admiral Sherman leaves a wife, one daughter—married to a naval officer—and five brothers—two of whom are now on active duty in the armed services.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] in his remarks of sympathy and in his tribute to the late Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations.

My tenure of service here has not been very long when compared to the tenure of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], but I have watched these military men come and go. Just last week we finished 11 weeks of hearings on the military appropriation bill, before which 500 witnesses appeared, including Admiral Sherman. I wish to say that in my time no more able officer of any service has appeared on the scene in Washington. It is a terrific loss to the Navy and to the Department of Defense and to the free world that Admiral Sherman, through the intensity of his effort over these recent months, has become a casualty in this world conflict.

I had selected him in my own mind, as I know hundreds of others had, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at an appropriate future time. He was

a man of the very highest caliber, the finest sensibilities, a diplomat, a naval hero, a scholar, a gentleman; so, naturally, all of us are shocked, grieved, and distressed over the terrific loss which America and the free world have sustained, and I am glad to join with my colleague from Georgia in these words of tribute honoring the memory of a very great man.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and service of the late Admiral Sherman.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. In my extension of remarks on the life and service of the late Admiral Sherman I ask unanimous consent that I may include two or three newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, all of us, I am sure, subscribe wholeheartedly to the fine sentiments expressed, and the well-deserved tributes paid to Admiral Forrest P. Sherman by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Yesterday morning as I listened to the radio I was stunned and grieved to learn of the sudden and untimely death of our Chief of Naval Operations, who suffered two heart attacks at his hotel in Naples, Italy.

Admiral Sherman was a natural-born sailor, having loved the sea and ships since his early boyhood. His grandfather was an old sea captain in New England and he comes from sturdy stock. His five brothers, along with himself, served patriotically in the armed services of our country. In 1917, Admiral Sherman graduated second in his class at the Naval Academy and during World War I, he served on board the U. S. S. *Nashville* in the Mediterranean. Following that war he served at sea, but after taking flight training was designated a naval aviator and never lost his interest in this branch of the service.

Advancing in rank to captain in 1942, he was in command of the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Wasp* which was sunk by an enemy submarine in the Solomons campaign in the Pacific—but not until his stricken ship inflicted great damage on the enemy. By brilliant maneuvering, Admiral Sherman, though wounded in that battle, succeeded in getting more than 2,000 of his 2,200 men to safety, and was the last man to leave his ship. For this heroic exploit he was awarded the Navy Cross.

Admiral Sherman recovered to serve with distinction in the Pacific during the remainder of the war on the staffs of Admirals Towers and Nimitz. He was promoted to rear admiral and awarded both the Legion of Merit and the Distinguished Service Medal for his outstanding service.

Following World War II, Admiral Sherman served under Admiral Nimitz as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations with the rank of vice admiral, and participated as the Navy's representative in conferences which brought about unification of our armed services. From January 1948 until November 2, 1949, Admiral Sherman served as commander of a large carrier task force in the Mediterranean, from which command he was sworn in as Chief of Naval Operations.

Because of his exceptional talents, his devotion to duty, his patient research, intensive studies, and because of his tact and diplomacy combined with his unsurpassed courage, he rose, due to his personal worth and admirable qualities of leadership, to the highest position in our United States Naval Forces.

Admiral Sherman was more than simply a fighting man at sea. He possessed broad knowledge and wise statesmanship. He was always calm and considerate of the views of men with whom he disagreed. He possessed a rare faculty to reconcile differences and to achieve united action from men with divergent points of view. As Chief of Naval Operations he did much to restore unity and good will amongst the different branches of our armed services and succeeded in building up the strength of our naval forces.

Not only will Admiral Sherman be remembered for his achievements in time of war, but for the definite and courageous stand which he took on present day issues.

One of the most illuminating and courageous witnesses before the recent Senate investigation of the MacArthur controvery was Admiral Sherman. Rising above personalities he urged a United Nations blockade of Red China. He realized that following the economic sanctions recently voted by the United Nations against Communist China, that a naval blockade—not by the United States alone, but by the United Nations—would shut off essential commodities and war materials to China, such as steel, rubber, oil, industrial chemicals, pharmaceuticals, machine tools, electronics equipment, as well as foodstuffs.

The following article by Cecil Holland which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of June 3, 1951, gives the essence of Admiral Sherman's view on this particular matter:

SHERMAN SCORES WITH SENATORS IN URGING U. N. BLOCKADE OF CHINA

(By Cecil Holland)

The Senate investigation of the MacArthur controversy took an important new turn with the testimony last week of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman advocating a United Nations blockade of the China mainland.

The Chief of Naval Operations, during the 2 days he was a witness, testified that he considers a naval blockade as the next logical step to the economic sanctions recently voted by the United Nations against Communist China.

He emphasized, however, that he was opposed to a blockade imposed by the United States alone. He said the action should be started—and started at once—through the United Nations, and expressed the opinion that in the event the Korean war keeps dragging on such a course will become likely.

AFFIRMATIVE COURSE

The testimony of the 54-year-old admiral created a profound impression on the members of the 26-man investigating committee—Armed Services and Foreign Relations. For them, it was the first definite and affirmative course of action, short of all-out war, that has been presented in the course of the inquiry, aside from the controversial program advanced by General MacArthur himself.

That program has been rejected by the witnesses who have been presenting the administration's side of the controversy. It called for economic sanctions and a naval blockade more drastic than the one proposed by Admiral Sherman, for aerial bombardment of Chinese bases and coastal centers and for the use of the Chinese Nationalists troops from the island of Formosa.

Secretary of Defense Marshall and other witnesses have said the MacArthur program carried with it a grave risk of starting another global war. But no firm alternative proposal was offered in the place of what many members of the investigating committee fear will become a stalemate costly in blood in Korea. It remained for Admiral Sherman to set a more affirmative course.

Chairman RUSSELL of the joint committee said he considered Admiral Sherman's views "highly significant and important." Senator BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine said he was "enthusiastic" to have "an adequate presentation of the significance of naval blockade," and added:

"I think it must have had a profound impact on this committee as well as on the country."

The impact may be even more far reaching. It seems bound to lead to a demand for more emphatic action by the administration to win approval of the blockade proposal from Great Britain and other allies.

This was pointed up during a part of Admiral Sherman's examination by Senator BREWSTER when he said that the Senate hearings and "the public discussion of the problems in the Far East" had played a part in getting the economic sanctions approved by the United Nations:

"Senator BREWSTER. The temper of the American people is being profoundly affected, is it not? * * * Our allies have come to recognize that the American public is increasingly concerned over measures which are involved in the sacrifice of our sons?

"Admiral SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

"Senator BREWSTER. And I assume that there are a variety of forms of persuasion that can and are used in international intercourse to persuade our allies to cooperate?

"Admiral SHERMAN. Yes, sir."

Admiral Sherman told Senator RUSSELL he was satisfied with the vigor with which the administration is pressing the United Nations for a declaration of a naval blockade since economic sanctions, the first step, have been obtained.

Asked if he had encountered difficulty in selling his proposition to other top-level officials in the Government, the admiral replied:

"I have not made any very vigorous attempt because this other operation has only been completed just recently; and I have informed my colleagues in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and associates in the State Department, that I felt this was the next thing."

Admiral Sherman indicated his willingness to wait and see how the economic sanctions would operate before pushing for the further step of a naval blockade. But he pointed out that some countries already have served notice that they would trade with whom they pleased regardless of the U. N. action.

Secretary of State Acheson, in his first appearance as a witness in the inquiry, told the investigating committee the United States has not yet asked the United Nations to consider imposing a naval blockade.

He said the economic sanctions were the first step and expressed the opinion such an embargo "will be increasing in effectiveness." He also pointed out that some of this country's allies have serious problems which

make them "hesitate to take complete and drastic action."

BLOCKADE CRIPPLING

In a terse and statistics-filled statement, Admiral Sherman gave the committee a convincing argument why he thought a naval blockade should be carried out to cripple Communist China's military potential.

He said such a blockade would seriously interfere with these commodities essential to China's war economy—rubber, petroleum, and petroleum products, industrial chemicals, pharmaceuticals, machine tools, machinery, and electronics equipment. Despite repeated warnings from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Sherman said that trade with Red China was a threat against the security of the United States, such traffic has continued.

Between January and April 1951, the naval officer said, 450 American-built trucks went to China, with India being an important reshipment point. During April a Hong Kong firm offered to supply the Chinese Communists with 100 surplus General Motors 5-ton trucks and 10,000 sets of tires.

START DRAIN ON RUSSIA

During a 6-week period from February 22 to April 2, 1951, the admiral testified 235 western merchant ships visited Chinese ports—96 British, 46 Panamanian, and 22 Norwegian, among others.

In other testimony Admiral Sherman cited the advantages that would come from stopping the flow of war materials into Communist China.

He said it would force China to turn to Soviet Russia for supplies now being obtained elsewhere, with a consequent increased drain on Russian production. It would cause unemployment and serious financial difficulty in the Chinese urban centers depending on trade. Since the Chinese are susceptible to plagues and contagious disease, the stoppage of medical supplies would curtail the mobility of the Chinese armies.

Further, a naval blockade would have a tremendous psychological force, as it would, Admiral Sherman testified, "demonstrate to the Chinese Communists, and to neighboring Asian people, the power of the forces against communism—the effectiveness of sea power, a power the Chinese Communists can do little to thwart."

Admiral Sherman gave it as his opinion that the Russians would not resist a blockade imposed by the United Nations; they would be likely to resist one attempted by the United States, possibly with force. "Since power is the final arbiter in international law," he added, "any blockade is fraught with problems if objected to by a neutral willing to use power."

CLASSIC FORMULA

The plan proposed by the admiral was in line with the classic application of a blockade under international law. The ports of Communist China would be effectively sealed off. It would not include such ports as Port Arthur and Dairen, under Russian de facto control, since such a blockade, the admiral said, could not be "conducted in accordance with established international law."

But he emphasized that ships of neutrals bound for those ports could be taken off or the ships sent to another port for unloading.

As surprising as Admiral Sherman's testimony was regarding a naval blockade, it could not be construed as reflecting any differences with his associates on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or with General Bradley, the chairman. When questions on the blockade were put to those witnesses, they replied that Admiral Sherman should be questioned about the problem—and this, with what the admiral testified himself, indicated that the matter was being explored by the Joint Chiefs.

The admiral's proposal also differed substantially from what General MacArthur advocated in the way of a naval blockade. The dismissed far-eastern commander said he would blockade the entire China coast, including Darien and Port Arthur.

He said it would be desirable to obtain the cooperation of the other U. N. countries fighting in Korea, but that if this could not be done he would favor the United States "going it alone."

Admiral Sherman said: "I am definitely opposed to going it alone in operating against China."

The admiral also testified that Allied nations with shipping and navies should participate in the blockade, in the event conditions reach that point, so that each country could police its own nationals.

Admiral Sherman, emphasizing that the Navy is stronger now than it has been at any time except in the peak of World War II, said a blockade could be carried out, as far as this country is concerned, with only "a minor embarrassment" if it were done with the timing that additional ships could be sent from the United States to the Far East.

He explained that replacement ships would have to be taken out of "mothballs" to return to duty. According to Navy officials, this would be a relatively easy process, requiring a month or so at the most.

In respect to the Navy's readiness, the testimony of Admiral Radford contrasted with that given earlier in the week by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, the Air Force Chief of Staff.

General Vandenberg said the country has a shoestring Air Force in view of global commitments. For this reason, he said he opposed the MacArthur demand for bombing of enemy bases since it would reduce the effectiveness of the Air Force in carrying out its mission in the event of the outbreak of a major war in another part of the world—a war presumably with Russia.

The Air Force Chief also estimated it would require about double the country's present strategic air strength to carry out the MacArthur program while leaving sufficient planes for other Air Force assignments.

He urged Congress to do everything possible to build up the Air Force to its 95-group goal and soberly warned that even this is the interim program only. The Air Force received about $12,000,000,000 in the current fiscal year, and is scheduled to get approximately $19,000,000,000 in the fiscal period starting July 1.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of general knowledge that ever since the Korean war broke out, some of our allies in the United Nations, who have received much foreign aid from the United States, have not only slyly and clandestinely, but openly, boldly, and brazenly, shipped many essential raw materials and foodstuffs to our common enemy, the Communists, not only in Red China, but to Soviet Russia, and other of her satellites. This deplorable state of affairs should be ended at once. It can no longer be tolerated.

The following dispatch by the Associated Press which appear in yesterday's Washington Sunday Star, June 22, 1951, shows that many of the nations benefited by our generosity, have in turn, furnished, and are still furnishing, our common enemy with the very essential materials and instruments to destroy us:

BRITISH SHIPS TAKING MATERIALS TO RED CHINA, O'CONOR SAYS—VESSELS FLYING PANAMANIAN FLAG ALSO ACCUSED OF CARRYING THOUSANDS OF TONS

Senator O'CONOR, Democrat, of Maryland, said yesterday that "ships flying the British and Panamanian flags have delivered to Communist China in recent weeks thousands of tons of highly strategic materials."

The cargoes destined for Red China were loaded at ports in Europe and India, he said in a statement declaring that such trade offends the conscience of all right-minded people.

Senator O'CONOR is chairman of a Senate commerce subcommittee on export controls. He said his statement was based on data brought back from the Far East by a subcommittee investigator.

"Some way must be found," he said, "to prevent the very flags which are carried into battle (in Korea) by the soldiers of the United Nations from being used to protect cargoes carried to our common enemies for the purpose of dealing death to the forces of the United Nations."

Senator O'CONOR said the British ship *Alpha Orange* carried to the the Red China port of Canton 2,000 tons of high-grade steel and what was registered as dangerous cargo.

The latter, he said, was "presumably such items as industrial chemicals, inflammable fuels, or high explosives." He said the *Alpha Orange* loaded its cargo at Hamburg and Rotterdam.

He said another British ship, the *Greystone Castle*, sailed for Canton from Gydnia, Poland, with steel rails, synthetic rubber, 30 8-ton 6-wheel trucks, optical instruments, and sugar.

"These ships," he said, "sail up the Pearl River at Whampoa where the cargoes are discharged into lighters for Canton."

The Senator listed ships of Panamanian registry on which the subcommittee obtained information as the *Moldova*, the *Marion*, the *Atlantic Star*, the *San Antonio*, the *Fortune Star*, and the *San Fernando*.

"Almost half of their cargoes came from India, through the ports of Calcutta and Karachi," Senator O'CONOR said.

He noted that the National Security Council recently exempted India from a congressional ban on economic aid to nations that export war materials to Russia or her satellites.

"Although India may not be sending guns to the Communists," he said, "it seems clear from our information that she is permitting herself to be used as a source for shipments of critical materials—materials so critical in fact that the ships carrying them skirt Hong Kong to avoid the recently tightened British controls."

Mr. Speaker, it is now over 6 weeks since Admiral Sherman testified before the Senate committees urging a United Nations naval blockade of China, but the above article clearly shows as pointed out by Senator O'CONOR, Democrat, of Maryland, that the admiral's recommendations have been ignored or forgotten.

Not only will Admiral Sherman be forever remembered for his bravery and service in the Pacific during World War II, and for his definite, positive, and constructive suggestion that we at once establish a United Nations blockade of Red China, but also for the important mission he was on at the time of his sudden and tragic death.

Having served on the U. S. S. *Nashville* in the Mediterranean during World War I, and having commanded a large carrier task force in the Mediterranean following World War II, Admiral Sherman knew that geographical area as few other men do. He realized the imperative necessity of including Greece and Turkey in the North Atlantic Pact in order to defend the eastern Mediterranean, protecting our oil interests in the Near East

and keeping open the Suez Canal, and he also recognized that Spain should be included in the North Atlantic Pact because of her vital, strategic geographical location at the western end of the Mediterranean.

Spain, back of the Pyrenees, is a barrier and at the same time offers a good beachhead for joint naval and air bases. She will help defend Gibraltar and protect our air bases in Morocco and North Africa. Admiral Sherman did not necessarily accept the Spanish ideology or give his approval of the Franco regime, but he was realistic enough to face the problem squarely and acted with great boldness. From all reports he and Generalissimo Franco had held satisfactory conferences and it seems that he had largely succeeded in neutralizing the opposition of the liberal and socialist elements in England and France.

To those of us who have insisted on a sensible policy toward Spain, the death of Admiral Sherman is a terrific and tragic blow at this critical time. It is to be hoped, however, that others who believe as he did will carry on to consummate the important program he so ably espoused.

Following is an article by me which appeared in the Reader's Digest of May 1949, more than 2 years ago:

WHY NOT A SENSIBLE POLICY TOWARD SPAIN?

(By Hon. DEWEY SHORT, United States Representative from Missouri)

Why do we do business with Stalin, but refuse to do business with Franco? The answer may be in Alice in Wonderland; it isn't in the book of common sense.

We have no Ambassador in Madrid. General Franco's unofficial Ambassador at Washington, José Felix de Lequerica, has refrained from presenting his papers of accreditation to avoid a possible rebuff. Our trade relations with the Spanish people are suspended in contradictory vagueness.

Yet Great Britain has negotiated a $320,000,000 trade agreement with Franco's government. France has provided a $40,000,000 credit to Spanish railroads. Sweden, Ireland, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Turkey, and other nations have made commercial compacts, and all 16 Marshall plan countries are stepping up their trade relations with Spain. Thus, American tax dollars, donated by the Marshall plan, are being used by other nations to promote an exchange of goods with Spain.

Our attitude toward Spain is no less fantastic and self-defeating in other ways.

The food-raising potential of Spain and its important textile industry are reckoned in the over-all plans for feeding and clothing Western Europe; 3,000,000 tons of these goods provided by Spain last year reduced the strain on our own industry and transport facilities. Clearly, it is in our interest to expand Spanish production and exports of those items. They could be at least trebled, if only Spain could obtain—not as a handout, but by purchase—sufficient American fertilizers, farm machinery, transport equipment, and, above all, cotton.

It is no secret that our military high command, in calculating the European-defense equation, assigns an important place to the Iberian Peninsula. Our aid to Greece and Turkey against Communist expansion—in fact our whole Near East policy—is obviously intended to safeguard the eastern doors to the Mediterranean. Common sense demands similar attention to the western door, to which Spain holds the key.

There we have the best clue, incidentally, to Moscow's inordinate interest in the internal affairs of Spain. If the friends of the Kremlin should ever obtain a foothold on the peninsula and on the Spanish-African coast opposite, the Mediterranean would become a Red lake.

Spain's geographic position clearly makes it a bulwark and beachhead against aggression from the East. The Pyrenees make the Iberian Peninsula a natural fortress the availability of which in an hour of crisis may spell the difference between victory and defeat.

That fortress is today defended by an army of some 400,000, with 2,000,000 veterans available for reinforcement. Modern airfields suitable for our largest bombers are being constructed. Here is a primary base of operations—and without the hazard of pro-Soviet fifth columns which unhappily must be taken into account in most other Atlantic countries. At a time when western Europe is shaping up military plans in a realistic spirit and an Atlantic Pact is being hammered out, a strong and friendly Spain would be a valuable military asset.

Our anti-Franco policies cannot be explained by belated questions about the origins of the Spanish Government in bloody revolution, for on April 1, 1939, we unconditionally recognized the Franco regime. Virtually all other great powers had established unequivocal relations with Madrid at that time.

Neither can our perplexing behavior be accounted for by the character of the Franco regime. If the idea is that full diplomatic intercourse implies moral approval of a foreign government, how explain our present normal diplomatic relations with governments of every conceivable tinge—from Argentina to Soviet Russia? We support unabridged political contacts not only with recent enemies like Italy but with the governments of Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia whom we have publicly accused of usurping power through terror.

Can our attitude toward Spain be justified perhaps on the basis of Franco's record in the recent war? The behavior of all neutrals on the European Continent was of necessity opportunist; their first purpose was not to cut the bridges with either of the possible victorious coalitions.

While Dr. Goebbels' Diary was denouncing Franco for his refusal to help the Nazis, Prime Minister Churchill could tell the House of Commons in 1944: "There is no doubt that if Spain had yielded to German pressure, our burdens would have been much heavier. Spain's power to injure us was at its very highest when United States and British forces descended upon northwest Africa."

At the same time President Roosevelt, in a personal letter to Franco, wrote: "Your nation and mine are friends in the best sense of the word. * * * I believe the Spanish Government and the Spanish people wish to maintain neutrality and remain outside the war." That neutrality fitted perfectly into our best military interests.

On December 10, 1948, Mr. Churchill reaffirmed this fact in Parliament. "Spain," he said, "refused to aid the Germans to take Gibraltar and enter Africa, and the way Hitler and Mussolini were treated by General Franco is a monumental example of ingratitude."

Some 4,000 American fliers, forced to take refuge in Spain, were released to fly and fight again. The Franco government did not intern them, which is more than can be said for other neutrals, and for that matter, for Soviet Russia. Franco was reproached for his policies in the war only by Berlin and Rome. At no time did Spain collaborate with the Nazis in the overt manner of Soviet Russia between August 1939 and June 1941. To use the war record as a pretext for boycotting Spain makes no sense.

How does it happen then that we helped keep Spain out of the U. N., that we do not restore normal diplomatic representation, that we consent to the exclusion of Spain from the European recovery program and the Atlantic security plans?

The answer is simple. It was embodied in the recent House of Commons statement by Mr. Churchill: "I say there is certainly far more liberty in Spain under Franco than in any countries behind the iron curtain. The great mistake is to allow legitimate objections to Franco and his form of government to be a barrier between the Spanish people and the western powers with whom they have many natural ties. So far from leading to the downfall of Franco, it has consolidated his position at every stage.

"It is true that I agreed at Potsdam that Spain should not be invited to join the United Nations, but I said that in hope of obtaining full Russian cooperation in a real instrument of world peace."

Though other neutrals were admitted, the doors of the United Nations were slammed in Spain's face to appease Moscow. The U. N. Assembly recommendation to withdraw the heads of diplomatic missions from Madrid was another act in that tragicomedy of appeasement.

The futility of that appeasement has been proved and generally acknowledged. In nearly all other respects it has been abandoned. But ostracism of Spain continues through sheer inertia. It is carried to such ludicrous extremes that Spain is not invited to international conference on such subjects as civil aviation, health, and saving life at sea.

In his original announcement of the European-recovery proposal, Secretary Marshall declared: "Our policy is not directed against any country or doctrine." Nevertheless, Spain was kept out—to make it easier for the Kremlin to come in. And though Russia not only refused to join but compelled its satellites to reject our offer and set up its Cominform to sabotage the American effort, Spain still remains beyond Marshall-plan bounds. In the midst of a fateful cold war against communism, the most anti-Communist nation is isolated to please Moscow.

There is a vocal persistent anti-Franco minority in this country that constantly attempts to spread the myth that American public opinion would be offended by the ending of our present policy toward Spain. Any fair sample of public opinion will show that such a claim is without foundation and, in fact, that a majority would welcome a change in our present policy.

Mr. Churchill spoke of "natural ties" which bind England to Spain. Those ties are greater and more significant for our own hemisphere. Nearly all the Latin-American countries have deep-rooted cultural and sentimental attachments to Spain. Regardless of their political systems, they resent the humiliations heaped on their mother country. They are fully aware that the political and economic sanctions imposed on Spain were Moscow-made in the first place and have been maintained largely by pressure groups taking their cues from Moscow. They can no more reconcile this with our intensive anti-Communist professions that logical-minded North Americans can.

The time has come to establish normal relations with Spain. The present ambiguous policies are a continuing triumph for the Kremlin. Strategically, commercially, politically, Spain is indispensable to the Marshall plan's success, to victory in the cold war, and to security if we are forced into a shooting war.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of Admiral Sherman.

As a member of the subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the Armed Services, I came in contact with him frequently and was greatly impressed by his character and by his capacity.

Born in New Hampshire in 1896, a resident of Massachusetts, a brilliant student at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, he was destined to rise from the rank of ensign in 1917 to the rank of admiral and chief of naval operations in 1949, reaching the top post in the Navy at the age of 53, the youngest officer ever to attain this position.

His experience was broad, both in staff work and in the field. It included both the sea and the air. It included both World Wars.

It was reflected in among other decorations, the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, the Purple Heart, the Victory Medal, the Philippine Liberation Medal, the American Defense Medal, and the American and Asiatic Theater Ribbons.

He filled the position of Chief of Naval Operations with great ability, contributing greatly to the morale of the Navy.

His final mission in life to Spain was one of the greatest importance. It is to be hoped that it will be crowned with success.

His untimely death is a very great loss to the Nation in these difficult times.

THE LATE HONORABLE EDGAR HOWARD

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death of Hon. Edgar Howard, of Columbus, Nebr.

In a life span of 92 years, Mr. Howard achieved distinction in journalism, politics, statesmanship, and good citizenship. He was long the accepted dean of Nebraska editors and patriarch of Nebraska Democrats.

Many years ago he served as congressional secretary to William Jennings Bryan, and later, in his own right, he represented the Third Congressional District of Nebraska for 12 years. His service in this body terminated January 3, 1935. Subsequently, he continued an amazing activity notwithstanding his advancing years, and he wrote brilliantly for his beloved Columbus Daily Telegram, edited by him for nearly half a century.

Before coming to Congress, he was county judge, State legislator, and Lieutenant Governor of Nebraska.

Edgar Howard served his community, his State, and his Nation well. Many veteran Members of this House will remember his unique, kindly Quaker character and will regret, as I do, to know that a friend has passed.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was sorry to read of the death of our late friend and colleague, Edgar Howard. He was one of the most picturesque persons who ever served in the Congress of the United States, a man of unusual ability, of kind disposition, sweet character, and a very attractive personality. He numbered among his friends and admirers everyone who ever served with him, who knew him, or knew of him. We all know of his constructive and dynamic life, not only in the service of the public in the various public offices to which my friend from Nebraska has referred, in which Edgar Howard served with such ability, courage, and distinction but also for his courage as a member of the newspaper profession and as an editor of the great newspaper he headed. His son and two daughters can well be proud of the constructive life their father led and the contributions that he made in his lifetime to the progress of the country.

There is also one other thought and one memory that Edgar Howard leaves, and that is his close association, not only close association but also close friendship with another dramatic figure in American life, the late William Jennings Bryan. Their associations were very, very close, not only as friends but as collaborators in the field of public life and public service.

I join with the gentleman from Nebraska in extending to the son and daughters of our late colleague my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to learn from the gentleman from Nebraska of the death of a good friend and former Congressman, Edgar Howard. He was a lovable, picturesque figure and he delighted to bear some resemblance to his former illustrious chief, William Jennings Bryan.

He was devoted to the public service and directed his best efforts in behalf of country. He was a man sincere in his beliefs and enjoyed the warm friendship of all who knew him.

His death is a loss to his State and to the country. We all extend our sincere regrets to his family.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure and honor to serve with Edgar Howard. I knew him well. He was a unique individual, but ever a gentleman and a good American, eminent journalist, a splendid legislator, liberal minded, who always had the interests of the people, especially those of agricultural America, at heart.

I knew him before he came to Congress when he was secretary to William Jennings Bryan, with whom also I had a very close association during the many years he was very active politically.

Mr. Howard was a profound scholar, which, naturally, made him an interesting lecturer, radiocaster, jurist, and statesman. His principal interests while a Member of the House were connected with Indian affairs, agriculture, and reclamation and irrigation. He was ubiquitous in advocating these matters.

He wrote many articles for the national press on a wide diversity of subjects, and these would be of much interest and benefit to many Members if they could read them today. He was progressive, and as honest as the day is long. By his long hair, the dress of a Roman senator, dignified and stately bearing, he was readily recognized by those who visited the House gallery. Consequently, he was said to be the most picturesque and attractive personality in the House of his time.

If Mr. Howard could have his way there would be no laudatory mention of him today in Congress, which he graced with an inordinate talent for many years. He would say, in his modest fashion, that his passing was not news; but we can take advantage of him. Mr. Howard was a genuinely modest man.

As age came upon him he could not see or hear as well as he once had, nor walk so fast, yet I am told he retained, even in outward appearance, many stout youthful qualities. The vigor and enlightenment never went out of writing and radiocasts. Certainly nobody could accuse our friend's wide learning of superficiality. In no sense was he superficial or artificial. He rang true at all times and in all circumstances; verily he was a balanced man in an unbalanced world.

I share the other fine sentiments expressed about our deceased friend and extend to his family and kinsmen my heartfelt regrets at his passing.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who was a great friend of Edgar Howard.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, of course I join with my distinguished colleague from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] in what he has said about our former colleague, Hon. Edgar Howard.

I not only knew Edgar Howard, but I knew the man who trained him, William Jennings Bryan, the greatest Christian lay leader of modern times. The thing that impressed me about Edgar Howard was that he manifested that common honesty that guided Mr. Bryan in all his efforts in public life.

Not only that, he was one of the great Democrats of America. He believed that prosperity was built from the ground up and did not leak down from the top on to the masses. He was a real American. What a pity we do not have more men like him in public life today who are not willing to subordinate our country to the domination of foreign powers, but who would put the interests of his own country first.

He was a great Representative from the standpoint of serious devotion to his home State of Nebraska. He was opposed to those violent discriminations, such as the one-way freight rate with which every State south of the Ohio River and west of the Mississippi is now being punished. I cannot express the profound sorrow the passing of this great American has brought me.

I extend my sympathy to his bereaved family.

In the words of Shakespeare—

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Edgar Howard, who has taken the last boat to the realm of the unknown, was a unique character in Nebraska. He had long lived past his Biblical goal of threescore and 10; he had fourscore and 12. During his long lifetime in Nebraska, Edgar Howard had been through the ropes, as we say, politically. He was known as the dean of the Nebraska newspapermen. His editorial shafts were pointed, salty. We, who were hoping to be embryo politicals at least of 25 to 40 or 50 years ago, learned to respect Edgar Howard and his editorial writings. He was on the opposite side of the fence politically from me. When I was a member of the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature, candidate for Governor, later a member of the State health department and then a Member of Congress. Mr. Howard wrote many editorials about me. They were fair but pointed. We, who were coming up through the political roles in Nebraska, learned to respect what Edgar Howard would say. He had a fine philosophy of life. He made a great contribution not only to his community, but to the State and to the Nation. I regret his passing, but rejoice that he has left behind a fine heritage of writing for those who may follow to read and understand.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the life and death of Edgar Howard at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, for almost three quarters of a century Edgar Howard rendered distinguished service to our State and Nation. He had a keen mind, he loved his country, and he liked people. He commanded the respect of those who disagreed with him. He was one of Nebraska's outstanding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an editorial published in the Omaha World-Herald on July 20, 1951, concerning former Congressman Howard. The editorial, is as follows:

EDGAR HOWARD

Edgar Howard was 17 years older than the State of Nebraska and he figured prominently in its history for most of his 92 years.

Dean of Nebraska newspapermen, he was writing pungent editorials in the Columbus Daily Telegram until a few months before his death.

In politics, his career started almost 70 years ago and ended only last September when he appeared on the platform at a State meeting of Democrats. Many handsome and deserved things they said about him: Last of the giants of the Democratic Party in Nebraska; the fightingest Quaker the prairies ever saw; the Old Roman; the Grand Old Man of Nebraska Politics. At least a dozen descriptive titles were given him, all of them fitting. His long hair, which he had shorn only last year, the long-tailed coat, broad-brimmed hat, and string tie marked him in any company.

No man in the State ever had a fuller or more varied career. He was secretary to William Jennings Bryan, a probate judge, lieutenant governor, Member of Congress, and above all, a newspaperman.

Rarely are men's minds keen after 90 years, but Edgar Howard's was. Good Democrat that he was, his typewriter nevertheless flailed "Pendergastism" and Government extravagance. He delivered lusty blows against the "cement trust" and a thousand other inequities, yet he could write lyrical prose-poetry that came from the heart.

"How many colors does God hang in the sky when he paints a Nebraska sunset?" asked Edgar Howard in one of his most famous pieces. He could not count them. It was "enough to know that they were in number to represent every fragrant flower from my conservatory of memory * * * enough to know that they appealed to me more eloquently than orator's words or author's lines to struggle along the upward way, with promise sure that at the end of the journey I may be privileged to behold upon the horizon of Paradise another sunset, and in the radiance of it count the colors of a welcome smile."

A man of great and gentle spirit has left Nebraska.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. ZABLOCKI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GERMAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN RUSSIA

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that, even though more than 6 years have passed since VE-day, Communist Russia still holds, or has not accounted for, more than a million German prisoners of war.

These young men are sorely needed in their homeland, where the West German Government is struggling hard to establish and maintain a democratic system. Its greatest handicap is the lack of manpower and vigorous young leaders to build a decent standard of living, in order that democracy can survive and grow.

We all have citizens of German descent in our communities, and we know they make the highest type of citizens. They are hard-working and thrifty; they have become leaders in the civic and business affairs of America. They are among the foremost in the arts and sciences—in literature, music, and art, and in the many fields of engineering. The permanent loss of a million such men in the prime of life would be a severe blow to Germany and to the society of Western Europe as a whole.

These young men were forced into Hitler's army, and they now find themselves still in servitude—held as slave laborers, away from their families, homes, and loved ones, living under inhumane conditions, and, against their will, forced to help build up the Soviet war machine against a free world.

We read in ancient history how the prisoners of war were sold into slavery, and during the nineteenth century one of the major blots on civilization was the system of forced labor and exile practiced in the Russian Empire. But, now, substantially all nations except Soviet Russia conform to the Geneva Convention of 1929, which requires that the capturing nation furnish the names of prisoners it holds, or make notification of their death through some international organization, such as the Red Cross, or through a neutral power, in order that relatives and loved ones of the captured prisoners can know their status.

The Soviet Government claimed to have captured well over 3,000,000 prisoners of war, and immediately following the hostilities they had accounted for only about 1,900,000, leaving over 1,000,000 unaccounted for. Virtually nothing has come from behind the iron curtain as to their status—whether they are dead or alive. Little did people realize that the Soviet Union, the successor to the Russian Empire, would adopt methods in the field of slave labor and concentration camps, which would make the system of Imperial Russia look like a model of human rights. This horrible state of affairs is continued in spite of the obligation of the Soviet Union under the rules of international law, in spite of its solemn agreements made repeatedly, and just as repeatedly broken or ignored.

There has been continuous pressure on the Soviet Union from humanitarian organizations such as the Red Cross, from relatives of the imprisoned men, and from governments of other countries. In spite of this, the Soviet Union has at no time furnished details concerning prisoners of war in its custody. It has refused to provide information regarding prisoner-of-war deaths and has refused to permit an investigation in its territory by an impartial international body in order that the actual situation with respect to prisoners of war could be ascertained.

This state of affairs was called to the attention of the world during the last session of the United National General Assembly which adopted a resolution establishing a prisoner-of-war commission to study the problem. The members of the special Commission were named 3 weeks ago, and the work of the group is now being organized. It is my earnest hope that this Commission can clarify the situation which surrounds this obvious international crime. At the same time I hope that we continue to use every means at our disposal to remind all na-

tions of the world of this typical example of the disregard for the welfare or life of the individual which is practiced by a nation which is attempting to gain converts to its way of life.

PROPOSAL FOR TRANSIT INVESTIGATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the people of this great city now face another request for authority to make an additional increase in transit fares.

Unfortunately, the people of the metropolitan area are subject to the views of four different commissions, and here I refer to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission, the Virginia State Corporation Commission, and the Maryland Public Service Commission.

All of these authorities have more or less to say about how the transportation agencies serving the metropolitan area shall in the first place be permitted to operate, and in the second place, the rate of fare they may impose upon the public.

It does appear to me that the Committee on the District of Columbia should call for an absolute, first-class, all-inclusive investigation of the capital structure, the operating policies, the program of maintenance and safety, and such other phases of the subject as should be covered to determine to what extent, if any, the property is being milked by minority stockholders, to what extent, if any, the public is receiving good service and protection for fares paid, and to generally clear the atmosphere.

It is my understanding that the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission, through its chairman, Mr. Flannagan, has suggested a public hearing regarding the "reasonableness, adequacy of service, equipment and maintenance, and the safety of operations." In addition, I am informed that Major General Reginald C. Harmon, Judge Advocate General of the United States Air Force, has written a letter to the Interstate Commerce Commission, on behalf of the Defense Department, joining the Arlington County board and other groups who have also asked for an investigation.

I certainly hope that a thoroughgoing investigation will very shortly be held, and I urge the Committee on the District of Columbia of this body to add its strength to those requesting such an investigation.

OPS REGULATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a constituent has sent me a quote from one of the OPS regulations. It is as follows:

> Section 10, quota adjustment: If a slaughterer's adjusted cost for cattle slaughtered in a given establishment during a given accounting period exceeds his maximum permissible cost for that establishment for that accounting period, then the slaughterer may slaughter in that establishment during the next accounting period no more than the number of pounds live weight of cattle which he would be permitted to slaughter in that establishment under the quota allotted to him pursuant to the provisions of Distribution Regulation 1, as amended, reduced by a percentage determined as follows:

Mr. Speaker, my friend says, "If you have a Philadelphia lawyer in the House, get him to tell you what that means."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this morning we will have up the State Department appropriation bill. I remind the House, especially the Members on my side, that on December 15, 1950, the Republican conference at that time adopted the following resolution:

> In this critical hour, confidence of the American people in their leadership is essential to our security. It is completely obvious that Secretary Acheson and the State Department under his leadership have lost the confidence of the Congress and the American people and cannot regain it. Recognizing this fact we earnestly insist, for the good of our country, that Mr. Acheson be replaced as Secretary of State, that there be a thorough housecleaning of the State Department and changes in personnel and policies responsible for this lack of confidence.

Some changes have been made, Mr. Speaker. Others are needed.

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

ECONOMIC CONTROLS LEGISLATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was with reluctance that I voted for the emasculated controls bill passed by the House early Saturday morning. At that time I did not realize that even the Republican press, as I noticed just this morning, would criticize the bill as passed. They are all of the same opinion, that that bill is against the public interest of the country and against the interests of the consumer. Consequently, it should not have been passed in the weakened form that it was.

As I suspected, the unholy alliance of reactionary Republicans and Southern Dixiecrats is jubilant over its success in emasculating the controls provisions of the Defense Production Act. They pride themselves on their ability to unload the responsibility for this emasculation on the Democratic administration and the Democratic Congress. Yes, the Democratic Party has a majority in both Houses of Congress, but unfortunately, it is only a paper majority. The coalition brought about by the greedy vested and special interests and their hungry and avaricious profiteers, are in the saddle; they are directly responsible for the sabotaging of this important legislation which will cost the Government untold billions in added costs in the procurement program for defense, as testified to by General Marshall, and which will cost the consumers added billions in their struggle to make ends meet under these skyrocketing prices.

Not only did this coalition fail to adopt the recommendations of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the administration to control commercial rents, which in many instances have increased as much as 300 percent, but they succeeded in exempting residential hotels from controls, which affected only one city—my city of Chicago—notwithstanding the fact that the owners of these residential hotels, during the period 1947–49, when they were decontrolled, raised their rentals sky-high. When these residential hotels were again brought under the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act by the 1949 amendments, these owners were permitted to retain the peak rent rates they established during their holiday period 1947–49. These profiteers were not suffering in any sense of the word. They reaped unconscionable profits during their decontrol period, and are now in position to add to their "take" under the decontrol provision inserted in this bill. However, these owners had the audacity to come before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, through their paid lobbyists, to urge and recommend the complete repeal of controls over their housing accommodations and the Committee, by a very narrow margin, voted to include section 206 in the bill. I offered an amendment on the floor of the House to strike out this section, and my motion lost by but an 18-vote margin, solely because of my inability to secure sufficient time to fully explain the situation we, in Chicago, were confronted with.

I also called attention to the effect the action of this unholy alliance would have on the millions of citizens holding Government bonds to whom we pledged a guarantee of the face value of these bonds at maturity amounting to 25 percent more than they paid in. Actually, by the action of this coalition, there is the grave danger of the depreciation of these billions of bonds in dollar value to 50 cents or less when they come due.

While the Treasury Department is intensifying its drive for the sale of defense bonds, the report shows that $359,000,000 of these bonds were cashed in during the first quarter of 1951. The second quarter is showing no change in this trend. This is undoubtedly due to the fears entertained by millions of

Americans over the constantly increasing cost of living and their need for ready cash to meet these mounting home expenses. The Republican interest-owned membership of Congress, nearly all of whom voted solidly to destroy the controls provisions of the Defense Production Act, feel they will be able to unload this responsibility for their acts on the Democratic paper majority in Congress. In this they will come to a sad awakening when these matters are brought home to full realization to the consumers and the masses of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the membership to a few of the comments contained in the editorials of some of our leading newspapers on this important legislation.

The Washington News of July 23 commented:

The shabby trick of the Republican-southern Democratic coalition which, by ordering a 120-day freeze of many prices and all wages, attempted to make it appear that the enemies of effective controls were really their friends.

And further:

The conference committee's task is to reconcile differences between the two bills (House and Senate) and produce a single measure which, if and when both branches of Congress approve it, will be sent to President Truman. Since the life of the present law expires a week from tomorrow, the committee will have to work fast. There is still danger that it won't work well—that its product will contain the worst, rather than the best, features of the material before it. That could confront Mr. Truman with the choice between signing a bad bill into law or using his veto power, which might mean no controls at all.

The Washington Post of July 23, in its editorial headed "Weaker controls," concluded as follows:

The bill that finally emerges will undoubtedly be a much weaker measure than the Defense Production Act that it replaces or rather extends in a much-amended form. For both the House and Senate have turned down requests for stronger control powers and imposed hampering restrictions on existing controls. In brief, the new legislation will fall short of giving the administration what it has asked for and will deprive it of some powers needed to enable the stabilization agencies to do an effective enforcement job.

The Christian Science Monitor, in its issue of July 21, had this to say, in part, editorially:

Government by coalition is admittedly difficult. Opposition by coalition can be frantic.

Sponsored as often by southern Democrats as by Republicans and backed by a shifting antiadministration coalition, the House, sitting as a Committee of the Whole, voted:

To continue the OPS's authority (with some restrictions on farm products) to adjust prices downward (roll-backs) as well as upward.

To require that no ceilings be set on any product which would deny any producer or distributor a profit less than 85 percent of his best of three years, 1946–49.

To require that all ceilings permit any producer or distributor to pass on to the consumer the state income and gross receipts taxes he may pay.

To freeze all prices (except for rents and farm products selling under parity) and wages for four months at the July 7 level.

Which adds up to a legislative crazy quilt which, were it to be enacted into law, would seem utterly impossible of administration.

What Americans were witnessing on Capitol Hill was a composite of gestures toward insistent producer groups and of political irresponsibility.

But political irresponsibility is dangerous stuff to have around. It may please people who don't admire the administration (and there are many) to see it squirm in a straitjacket put upon it by poor legislation. But on a matter as important as inflation, where does that put the country?

The New York Sunday Compass of July 22 had this to say:

Administration supporters grimly conceded that the bill had been virtually riddled beyond recognition in the last 2 weeks by a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats.

The New York Times, in its news columns of July 22, referred to the action of the coalition as follows:

The coalition of northern Republicans and southern Democrats which has been trying to put an end to all effective controls over prices and wages did not last out the night. The final vote was on a measure by no means satisfactory to the administration but still containing no positive guaranties of inflation.

The New York Herald Tribune carried this statement in its issue of July 23:

Both of the bills weaken price control, including its enforcement. They increase (is it possible) the special privilege accorded to agricultural industries; each of them weakens rent control.

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

MIDYEAR ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 190)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk; and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and ordered printed, with illustrations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1951.

The honorable, the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith a midyear economic report to the Congress. This is supplementary to the Economic Report of the President of January 12, 1951, and is transmitted in accordance with section 3 (b) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, the Economic Situation at Midyear 1951, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. This is District day. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] is recognized.

HEIGHT OF BUILDING, 2400 SIXTEENTH STREET, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4262) relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill for the benefit of the House?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to provide for the continued use of the penthouse on the building at 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., in the District of Columbia, for the same purposes for which it has been continuously used since it was constructed in 1918 regardless of any restriction of height of buildings imposed by law.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia on April 1, 1918, granted permission to the owners of the building to enlarge the penthouse which is now being used for the same purpose as it was when permission was granted, even though technically the use has been in violation of the act of Congress approved June 1, 1910, 36 Statute, page 453, title 5, section 405, District of Columbia Code, 1949 edition.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I would like to ask the gentleman about the 10 or 12 bills before the House today. This is the only bill that does not have the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Bureau of the Budget. Most of them came out of the committee last year and were sent to the Senate. Now they are back here asking House action. They have been approved by the House District Committee unanimously?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think it is interesting to note that this particular penthouse is a little higher than the dome of the Capitol Building. It has been a sort of tradition in the Capital that no building in the District of Columbia shall be higher than the Dome that sits on this Capitol. Someway, somehow, this little penthouse was built on top of this 2400 Sixteenth Street building. I think it was used for a storeroom instead of a penthouse. If I had it, I should like to live there and enjoy the scenery. But this bill which does not have the approval of the District Commissioners is controversial. I doubt if it needs to be taken down. There is a policy on building and that accounts for this bill to change the policy in this one case.

If that hurts anybody's feelings, they should object to it. It makes no difference to me.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the continued use of the penthouse on the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., District of Columbia, for the same purposes for which it has been heretofore continually used since it was constructed in 1918, shall not be restricted or prohibited by reason of any restriction on the height of buildings imposed by or under any provision of law.

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.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF DISBURSING OFFICER AND AUDITOR OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 259) to fix the responsibilities of the Disbursing Officer and of the Auditor of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the purpose of the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to make accounting practices of the District of Columbia uniform with those followed by the Federal Government. Under existing law, the responsibility for illegal or wrongful payment of funds is fixed on the Disbursing Officer of the District of Columbia. This bill would impose such responsibility on the Auditor of the District of Columbia, who has access to the information necessary to determine the propriety and legality of payments, consistent with Federal practice.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, order, or regulation, the Disbursing Officer of the District of Columbia shall (1) disburse moneys only upon, and in strict accordance with, vouchers duly certified by the Auditor of the District of Columbia or by one or more employees in the office of such Auditor duly authorized in writing by such Auditor to certify such vouchers; (2) make such examination of vouchers as may be necessary to ascertain whether they are in proper form and duly certified; and (3) be held accountable accordingly.

SEC. 2. The Auditor of the District of Columbia or any employee in his office duly authorized in writing by such Auditor who certifies a voucher shall (1) be held responsible for the existence and correctness of the facts recorded in the certificate or otherwise stated in the voucher or its supporting papers, including the correctness of computations on such voucher, and for the legality of the proposed payment under the appropriation or fund involved; (2) be required to give bond to the United States and to the District of Columbia, with good and sufficient surety, approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, in such amount as may be determined by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and (3) be held responsible for and required to make good to the United States or to the District of Columbia the amount of any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment resulting from any false, erroneous, or misleading certification made by him as well as for any payment prohibited by law or which did not represent a legal obligation under the appropriation or fund involved: *Provided*, That the Comptroller General may, in his discretion, relieve such certifying officer or employee of liability for any payment otherwise proper whenever he finds (1) that the certification was based on official records and that such certifying officer or employee did not know, and by reasonable diligence and inquiry could not have ascertained, the actual facts, or (2) that the obligation was incurred in good faith, that the payment was not contrary to any statutory provision specifically prohibiting payments of the character involved, and that the United States or the District of Columbia has received value for such payment: *Provided further*, That the bond required by this section to be given by the Auditor of the District of Columbia shall be conditioned for the faithful discharge of all of the duties of his office and shall be in lieu of any other bond now required by law.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other act to the contrary, neither the Disbursing Officer of the District of Columbia nor the Auditor of the District of Columbia or any employee in his office authorized by him to certify vouchers, pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be held liable for overpayments made for transportation furnished on Government bills of lading or transportation requests when said overpayments are due to the use of improper transportation rates, classifications, or the failure to deduct the proper amount under land-grant laws or equalization and other agreements.

SEC. 4. The liability of any person who certifies any voucher pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be enforced in the same manner and to the same extent as now provided by law with respect to enforcement of the liability of disbursing and other accountable officers; and they shall have the right to apply for and obtain a decision by the Comptroller General on any question of law involved in a payment on any vouchers presented to them for verification.

SEC. 5. This act shall become effective on the first day of the third month following the date of its enactment.

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

MAKING CANCER AND ALL MALIGNANT NEOPLASTIC DISEASES REPORTABLE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (S. 260) to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the Chair will permit, let me say that there is no money involved in this bill; that 28 States now require the reporting of malignancy to the State health department. We are not doing that in the District of Columbia. It seems to me that with the new emphasis being placed upon cancer control that it is necessary for the District of Columbia to go along with the other States in a method of reporting so that cancer perhaps can be handled and we hope in the near future the cause and cure may be discovered. I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to permit the Health Officer and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to gather the information necessary for study and the control of the epidemiology of cancer and all other neoplastic diseases.

Malignancies from cancer in the District of Columbia have risen from 38 per 100,000 population in 1880, to 178.4 per 100,000 population in 1950.

At the present time the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, and Wyoming have similar statutes.

The reports of cases made pursuant to the provisions of regulations promulgated under this act will be confidential and not open to public inspection. This information will not be divulged or made public so as to disclose the identity of any person whom they may relate except upon order of court, and unless already published shall be divulged or made public only on the written authorization of the Director of Public Health.

This legislation will not entail the hiring of additional employees nor any additional expense to the District of Columbia.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to promulgate regulations requiring that cancer, sarcoma, lymphoma (including Hodgkin's disease), leukemia, and all other malignant growths be reported to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The reports of cases made pursuant to the provisions of regulations promulgated under this act shall be confidential and not open to public inspection. The information in such reports shall not be divulged or made public so as to disclose the identity of any person to whom they may relate, except upon order of court, and unless already published shall be divulged or made public only on the written authorization of the Director of Public Health.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act, or regulations promulgated thereunder, shall be construed to compel any person suffering from any of the diseases listed in section 1 to submit to medical examination or treatment.

SEC. 4. The said Commissioners are authorized to prescribe a reasonable penalty or fine, not to exceed $100, for the violation of any regulation promulgated under the authority of this act, and all prosecutions for violations of such regulations shall be in the criminal branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia in the name of the District of Columbia upon information filed by the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants.

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

LICENSING OF SIGHTSEEING BUSSES AND AMBULANCES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill S. 261 and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to change the date on which licenses may be issued to sightseeing vehicles and other passenger vehicles for hire, having a seating capacity of eight or more passengers. Under existing law the licenses date from April 1 and may be issued on or after March 15. The licensing officers desire more time to issue these licenses and recommend that they may be issued on or after March 1. The bill also changes the license year to begin on April 1 rather than July 1, with respect to ambulances for hire and passenger vehicles used solely for funeral purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriation to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, be further amended by deleting from subparagraphs (c) and (d) of paragraph 31 thereof the word and figures "March 15" where the said word and figures appear and inserting in lieu thereof the word and figure "March 1."

SEC. 2. That subparagraph (i) of paragraph 31 of section 7 of said act, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"(i) Owners of ambulances for hire and owners of passenger vehicles which, when used for hire, are used exclusively for funeral purposes shall pay a license tax of $25 per annum for each such vehicle used in the conduct of their business. Licenses issued under this subparagraph shall date from April 1 in each year but may be issued on or after March 1 of each year: *Provided, however*, That licenses issued under this subparagraph for the license period expiring on June 30 of any year shall remain valid until such expiration date, and the holders of such licenses, if otherwise qualified, shall be entitled to have issued to them upon expiration of such licenses new licenses for the license year beginning April 1 to be prorated for the remainder of the license year."

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

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN SUITS AND CLAIMS AGAINST THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (S. 262) to amend section 3 of an act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia, approved February 11, 1929, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if this is not another of those bills which has the unanimous consent and approval of the District Commissioners.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct; also the corporation counsel and the Commissioners state that they are losing a great deal of money by not being able to settle some of these suits as this bill provides.

The purpose of this bill is to allow the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District up to the amount of $10,000, rather than $5,000 as presently provided. It also gives the Commissioners authority to settle, up to the amount of $10,000, suits brought by the District against others. Under the present law the Commissioners have no authority whatever to settle such claims.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act approved February 11, 1929, entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia" is amended by striking out of the first sentence of said section the figures "$5,000" and substituting in lieu thereof the figures "$10,000."

SEC. 2. Add a new section to said act to be numbered section 5 and to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That upon a report by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia showing in detail the just and true amount and condition of any claim or suit which the District of Columbia may now or hereafter have against any person, firm, association, or corporation, and the terms upon which the same may be compromised, and stating that in his opinion a compromise of such claim or suit would be for the best interest of the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they hereby are, authorized to compromise such claim or suit accordingly: *Provided, however*, That no claim or suit so compromised shall be reduced by an amount greater than $10,000: *And provided further*, That this section shall not apply to claims or suits for taxes or special assessments."

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

APPREHENSION AND DETENTION OF INSANE PERSONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 263) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes, approved April 27, 1904, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to point out that this is a bill which permits doctors of the Air Force and Veterans' Administration employed by the Administration, who are not licensed here in the District of Columbia, to issue certificates of insanity. If this is handled properly, there will not be any harm come from it. But I want to register at this point a question as to the wisdom of the insanity procedure on commitments in the District of Columbia. I think it is in need of review and revision and should be brought up to date.

There rests in this bill some inherent evils which might need to be corrected. I can see where a doctor or group who had it in for someone might find it easy to commit that individual to an insane asylum. While I am not going to object, I think it is one of those bills that the District Committee, instead of accepting the Senate hearings, probably should have had some hearings itself in order to determine some of the possibilities and difficulties that might arise in the future relative to committing people to an asylum. Safeguards are needed. The House District Committee should have hearings on these questionable bills.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit commissioned surgeons of the United States Army Air Force and physicians employed by the Veterans' Administration, who are neither licensed nor resident in the District of Columbia, to sign certificates relating to the sanity or insanity of any person in the District of Columbia. Under existing law this has been prohibited, since the above-mentioned were not within those excepted from the licensing and residence requirements of the act. In addition this bill will remove the requirement of residence in the District of Columbia as a prerequisite of the signing of certificates by physicians who are licensed to practice in the District of Columbia.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes", approved April 27, 1904, as amended (sec. 21-330, D. C. Code, 1940 edition), is hereby amended to read:

"That for the purpose of this act no certificate as to the sanity or the insanity of any person shall be valid which has been issued (a) by a physician who has not been regularly licensed to practice medicine in the District of Columbia, unless he be a commissioned surgeon of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, or Public Health Service, or a physician employed by the Veterans' Administration; or (b) by a physician who is related by blood or by marriage to the person whose mental condition is in question. No certificate alleging the insanity of any person shall be valid which has been issued by a physician who is financially interested in the hospital or asylum in which the alleged insane person is to be confined; nor, except in the case of physicians employed by the United States or the District of Columbia, shall any such certificate be valid which has been issued by a physician who is professionally or officially connected with the hospital or asylum."

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

INCREASING THE FEE OF JURORS IN CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (S. 488) to increase the fee of jurors in condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, 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.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if this is not legislation which simply equalizes the pay of all jurors, whether they are in the District of Columbia or for the Federal Government?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct. The committee felt that jurors of this type should be paid the same as ordinary jurors.

The purpose of this bill is to increase the compensation for jurors in condemnation cases brought by the District of Columbia government from $5 to $10 per day. At the present time petit and grand jurors receive $7 per day. The Federal Government pays condemnation jurors $10 per day. Under existing law, condemnation jurors must have not only the qualifications of regular jurors, but in addition must be freeholders and, accordingly, are selected from a special jury panel.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 491L of subchapter 1 of chapter 15 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189), as added by the act approved April 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 151), and section 1609 of chapter 55 of such act approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the act approved February 23, 1905 (33 Stat. 733), be and hereby are repealed.

SEC. 2. In all eminent domain cases instituted by or on behalf of the District of Columbia, each juror shall receive as compensation for his services the sum of $10 per day for every day necessarily employed in the performance of his duties.

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

REGULATION OF THE PRACTICE OF PODIATRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 490) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia" 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.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to raise from $2 to $5 the annual registration fee required of licensed podiatrists in the District of Columbia.

The only income which the Board can count on from year to year is that derived from the annual registration fee paid by licensees. There are only 93 licensed podiatrists in the District, making the annual fixed income $186. This income may be supplemented by examination fees from new applicants for licenses.

Under the act of June 29, 1940, the secretary-treasurer of the Board of Podiatry Examiners has authority to enforce the provisions of all laws relating to the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia. The board is also authorized to employ persons to assist in the investigation of violations of the act. All expenses of the board are payable from fees collected by the board. Since there are fixed expenses such as compensation to board members, secretarial help, postage, equipment, printing and supplies, the board feels that the registration fee should be raised from $2 to $5.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this is another instance where home rule might be of some benefit in the District of Columbia. There are only 93 licensed podiatrists in the District of Columbia. Those are people who treat your feet. Maybe there should be more to treat your head. But they want to raise their fees from $2 to $5 so that they can get $465 in order to do a little inspecting of people who want to be licensed in podiatry.

I submit when we get home rule of some kind we will get rid of some of these chicken-feed bills and will have someone down in the Commissioners' office to handle them.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 2–710), is amended by striking out "$2" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$5."

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

THE BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 492) to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare, and for other purposes, 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.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would explain this bill because it is quite a change in policy of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to remove certain requirements which have the effect of limiting the use of the property designated as the National Training School for Girls, located at MacArthur Boulevard and Loughboro Road.

The requirements are listed below.

First. Under the law the only girls that can use the property are those committed direct to the National Training School for Girls.

Second. The court commits only those girls who have been guilty of very serious offenses, and those girls who are committed are committed for minority, that is, 21 years of age. As a result, the court has committed only a few girls to the institution, and at present there are only 16 girls at the institution, whereas the institution has a capacity of 75 to 80 girls.

At the present time the Board has approximately 55 girls who are being maintained at a private institution at Croome, Md., at the expense of the District. The continued operation of this institution appears to be uncertain because of the death of the owner. These girls would have to be cared for in some other place if the institution closes. The National Training School for Girls is a desirable place for caring for and rehabilitating these girls. The establishment of the training school as a place where the Board of Public Welfare can care for and train girls placed in its custody would make it possible to establish an institution of the industrial home school type.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Congress in 1888 established a reform school for girls on MacArthur Boulevard. The buildings are still being used. For the last 4 years they have been used exclusively for Negro girls. I understand there are only 9 or 10 on an average in the institution. Several years ago I went out to look at this reform school, and I say, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has a duty to provide a better place than I saw then. The building was and is a fire trap. This bill permits the Welfare Board to take over some of the functions of the Juvenile Court. That may or may not be good. I hope the place is not overcrowded. The buildings are old, and if the Welfare Board is going to crowd 70 or more girls in these old buildings it would be dangerous. A real fire hazard. I just want to be recorded, at least, in saying that maybe later on a construction program will be started to properly house these girls. I admit, as the chairman has said, that it cost about $4,000 a year to care for one of these girls under the present situation, and if you had 70 in there, it would cost much less. But, I submit to you that there is a grave danger in crowding too many people in buildings that were built in 1888 as a reform school.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Public Welfare Board and the Commissioners advised me that conditions have been greatly improved since the gentleman visited the school.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is legislation that Mr. Edgar Morris appeared before the committee in behalf of, and there is not a Washingtonian that I know of that is more interested in this legislation. He is absolutely in favor of this change.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no girl shall be committed to the National Training School for Girls after the enactment of this act. Any girl who, but for the provisions of this act, would be subject to commitment to such school shall be subject to commitment to the Board of Public Welfare (hereinafter called the Board). Girls committed to such school prior to the enactment of this act shall remain subject to the supervision and care of the Board for the periods of their commitments, but may be removed by it to any other place of detention available to it. The Board is authorized to parole or discharge any girl committed to it or subject to its supervision as provided in this section. In the supervision and care of any such girl the Board is authorized, in its discretion, to use any public or private agency or institution, or private family home, either without expense or at a fixed rate of board.

SEC. 2. The buildings, grounds, and equipment of the National Training School for Girls shall be available for the care and training of children committed to the Board or received and accepted by it for care under the authority of this or any other act. Appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for the National Training School for Girls shall be available for the care and training of such children.

SEC. 3. Section 8 of the act entitled "An act revising and amending the various acts establishing and relating to the Reform School of the District of Columbia," approved May 3, 1876, as applicable to the Reform School for Girls of the District of Columbia (subsequently designated the National Training School for Girls) (31 Stat. 809; D. C. Code, sec. 32-908), as amended—

(1) by striking out "Reform School for Girls", wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "Board of Public Welfare";

(2) by striking out "to remain until she arrives at the age of 21 years unless sooner discharged by the board of trustees"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following: "Girls committed to the Board of Public Welfare may be committed for such periods as the courts may deem proper, subject to earlier discharge by the Board of Public Welfare, but no girl shall be so committed for a period extending beyond her twenty-first birthday."

SEC. 4. Clause (2) of section 14 of the act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia," approved March 19, 1906, is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "National Training School for Girls or the"; and

(2) by striking out the word "schools" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "school."

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

DEPUTY DISBURSING OFFICER FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 494) to provide for the appointment of a deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina explain the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to permit the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint one deputy disbursing officer and such assistant disbursing officers as the Commissioners may, in their discretion and subject to available appropriations, consider necessary. The Commissioners are limited to the appointment of one deputy but the bill provides no limit on the number of assistants, since the measure is designed to be permanent in its nature, and to provide flexibility for future needs. The bill does make the number of such assistants subject to available appropriations.

The deputy and each of the assistant deputy disbursing officers shall have authority to make disbursements as an agent of the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia; to sign checks drawn against disbursing accounts of the disbursing officer of the district, with the Treasurer of the United States, and to discharge all other duties of the disbursing officer. They are subject to the same liabilities and penalties prescribed by law in like cases for the disbursing officer and they are each required to give bond, as required by the Commissioners, in an amount of not less than $25,000 for the benefit of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District, and the disbursing officer. The Commissioners and the Secretary of the Treasury must approve such bonds and they are to be filed in the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The enactment of this legislation will not add to the expenses of the District of Columbia.

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

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall appoint a deputy disbursing officer of the District of Columbia and such assistant disbursing officers of the District of Columbia as they may, in their discretion and subject to available appropriations, consider necessary, at compensation to be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, such deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers to be subordinated to the Disbursing Officer, District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The deputy disbursing officer and the several assistant disbursing officers each shall have authority to make disbursements as an agent of the Disbursing Officer, District of Columbia; to sign checks drawn against disbursing accounts of the Disbursing Officer, District of Columbia, with the Treasurer of the United States; and to discharge all other duties required according to law or regulation to be performed by the Disbursing Officer, District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The deputy disbursing officer and the several assistant disbursing officers shall each be subject, for his official misconduct, to all liabilities and penalties prescribed by law in like cases for the Disbursing Officer, District of Columbia; and the deputy disbursing officer and each assistant disbursing officer shall give bond to the United Statees for the benefit of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Disbursing Officer, District of Columbia, conditioned for the faithful performance of the duties of each of their offices in the disbursing and accounting, according to law, for all moneys of the United States and of the District of Columbia that may come into his hands, which bond shall be in the amount required by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, but to be not less than $25,000, and to be subject to approval by the said Commissioners and the Secretary of the Treasury and to be filed in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 4. There is hereby repealed so much of the first section of the Act entiteld "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes", approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 555), under the subheading "For Auditor's Office" under the heading "General expenses" as reads: "deputy disbursing officer, who shall hereafter, in the absence of the disbursing officer, be autorized to transact all duties pertaining to sa'd disbursing officer, and who shall be required to give bond to the said disbursing officer in the sum of $25,000, conditioned on the faithful performance of the duties of his office, but said disbursing officer to be responsible to the United States, District of Columbia, and the people whom he pays, as now required by law, $1,500;".

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

AMENDING AN ACT OF JUNE 7, 1938

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 573) to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to increase the basic rate of compensation of the members of the board of barber examiners from $9 to $20 a day. Even though the rate is set from $9 to $20 a day, the rate is now actually $13.07 because of various pay acts which have been passed from time to time. For all practical purposes the increase would then be from $13.07 to $20.

The bill would also require the posting of a list of prices for the various services rendered by the barber shops. The bill also changes the penalty from a minimum of $25 to a maximum of $200. The bill has the approval of the Board of Commissioners and Board of Barber Examiners of the District of Columbia. To carry out the provisions of this bill would require no increase in the number of employees by the Barber Board and the increased compensation would be paid by the fees as set by the Barber Board.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this bill is another one of those bills to regulate barbers. Now, we had the foot doctors a minute ago. The barbers figure they ought to have $20 a day for inspections instead of $9. It also pro-

vides that they place in their shops a list of what they are going to charge for cutting hair, that is, of the people who do not have hair and those that do have hair. The board sets up some other regulations. I am just not sure how much good is in the bill. It does not cost the District anything. They do set up a $200 fine on these barbers for violation. I rather suspect that some of them will be up before the members of the District Committee before long complaining about the treatment they have received.

In that connection, I want to make a confession, Mr. Speaker. A few years ago we passed a bill for the architects and the engineers. It was a bill not just like this, but to regulate the architects and engineers of the District. It gave them certain procedures that they could handle in the District. It set up a code of ethics. Now if you want to build a new home you must get approval and blueprints and permits and have many many inspections.

Yes, in order to build a cement step at the kitchen door you need a blueprint and the help of an architect and engineer—the cost $25 to $50. It would be more than the step. In other words, in my opinion, the passage of that bill, and I am ready to have new legislation to have it repealed, has caused the people of the District of Columbia a great deal of distress and unnecessary expense.

If you want me to, I can cite some of these cases that have been called to my attention where the inspectors have come in and said, "You cannot do this. You do not have a blueprint or permit. You do not have the approval of the department." It makes your blood boil.

This is a barber's bill. I do not know; maybe the barbers need some help. Their present rate, I think they say, costs them $13.07 a day for the inspector. They now want $20 a day. I am not going to complain about that. But I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that before another Congress meets, some of these barbers out in the outlying districts that have a little barber shop in their home, or a small one-chair barber shop, who are doing a pretty good job taking care of the school kids and charging maybe 25 or 40 cents for a haircut per youngster, and maybe do not have the list posted in their barber shops, some of those barbers will be in your office and in the offices of the other Members, asking that something be done to give them a little relief.

I am not going to object to the consideration of the bill, but here again I say in another Congress you will find some of these little barbers in here complaining about regulations.

Mr. McMILLAN. I heartily agree with the gentleman on the architects' and engineers' bill. I personally held the bill up in committee for 2 years.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right.

Mr. McMILLAN. However, I do not believe this bill is in exactly the same category.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., 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 its enactment.

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

EXCHANGE OF LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLIAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 673) to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in 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 being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That where two lots or parcels of land abut each other and one of such lots or parcels belongs to the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, with the approval of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, are hereby authorized and empowerd, when in their judgment and discretion it is for the best interest of the District of Columbia, to exchange such District-owned land, or part thereof, for the abutting lot or parcel of land, or part thereof: *Provided*, That no such exchange shall be made unless the Commissioners of said District shall, 30 days prior thereto, publish in a newspaper of general circulation in the said District a notice of their intention to make such exchange and such notice shall include a description by lot or parcel number or otherwise of all lots or parcels to be exchanged and the appraised value thereof. The said Commissioners are hereby authorized to execute a proper deed of conveyance for the land belonging to the District to be conveyed and to accept a proper deed of conveyance from the owner of such abutting real estate. If, in the opinion of the Commissioners, the value of the land to be conveyed to the District is in excess of the value of the land to be conveyed by the District, the Commissioners are authorized to pay, within the limitation of appropriations therefor, to the abutting property owner the amount of such excess as determined by the Commissioners, on the basis of an appraisal, and, if the value of the land to be conveyed by the District is in excess of the value of the land to be conveyed to the District, the Commissioners shall require the abutting property owner to pay such excess as determined by the Commissioners, on the basis of an appraisal, as part of the consideration for the said exchange.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I dislike to take so much time when I know there is some important legislation following this, but this is important to the District.

Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to make it possible for the District to exchange some property that they may have for some other property that is abutting their property. The word "abutting" I think was not originally in the bill. They are doing it really for the purpose of building a sewage disposal plant down on the river.

I call the attention of my chairman and the House to this problem as far as the District of Columbia is concerned. The District of Columbia owns a great deal of real estate. Some of it they are using and some of it they are not using. I am thinking now of some property in Laurel that has a beautiful brick building on it built during the WPA days.

The ground covers 160 acres. To my knowledge it has never yet been used. I tried to ascertain just last week what the District of Columbia was doing with this particular property. It seems to me some committee ought to be set up to ask the District Commissioners to give to the Congress a list of real estate that they own and hold which they are not using.

We know that there is some property that they are going to buy in connection with the building of a hospital center. I think a hospital center is needed in the District. I believe now that they are going out to the old Soldiers' Home and expect to buy that for $1,500,000 or $2,000,000 to get started with this hospital center. They own some other real estate. This beautiful brick building that I spoke

of, I think it was used about 6 months, and since that time it has gone to pieces. If that land is not needed, it ought to be sold. I understand it is very valuable property. An up-to-date list of property both in and out of the District ought to be available. There are little parcels here and there which need to be put back on the tax rolls in some way.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is probably right about various pieces of property in the District of Columbia, but this particular bill applies only to exchanges on property which abuts another piece of property.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, I think that is right. I believe the committee has fixed this bill so that they are not exchanging property except if it is adjacent to or abuts the other property. The original intention of the bill was to make possible this exchange without the abutting features. That I thought was bad in the bill.

I also submit somewhere along the line an inventory ought to be had of the real estate that the District of Columbia now owns, which may or may not be used.

Mr. Speaker, I have no particular objection to this bill, except to say it does seem to me we ought to get a list of the real estate owned by the District of Columbia, with the view in mind of perhaps disposing of that real estate.

I do not think the District of Columbia ought to be in the business of acquiring large tracts of land, whether it is abutting that property or inside or outside of the District of Columbia.

It is a question that needs some review.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit the District of Columbia to exchange land which is owned by the District of Columbia for land abutting such land owned by the District of Columbia where, in the judgment of the Commissioners such exchange would be in the best interest of the District. If the parcels of land to be exchanged are of equal value the provision is made for the Commissioners to pay or to receive payments for the difference in value so as to make the exchanges fair to both parties.

Under this legislation no new employees would be required, nor would there be any additional cost except in cases where the Commissioners were required to pay additional revenue in exchange for land acquired by the District of Columbia.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up a resolution (H. Res. 336) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provision contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriation, 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 same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution which has just been read makes in order for consideration the bill providing appropriations for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and the Federal judiciary for the fiscal year of 1952. It provides for 6 hours of general debate. All points of order are waived against any of the provisions of the bill.

The 6 hours' general debate will give all gentlemen, who, from time to time have been criticizing the various departments, usually without justification, ample opportunity to proceed and devote some of their time in further criticizing those departments. I know there will be some gentlemen who will criticize the Secretary of State. I hold no brief for them, but I know that when the history is written it will clearly show that he was one of the greatest to serve as Secretary of State.

It has been my honor and privilege to serve with many outstanding men who have held the important position of Secretary of State. Without fear of successful contradiction, I will say that he has conducted that office as judiciously and under the most trying conditions as any other Secretary in the history of the Nation. Of course, I have not always agreed with him when he followed the advice of some of the outstanding Republicans, who I believe frequently sought to mislead him; but, with those exceptions, I think he has done splendid work, and his efforts in years to come will be acclaimed and appreciated.

I presume some gentlemen will again charge that he has some Socialists or Communists in his office. Personally, I think if a real investigation were made, we would find there would be more Fascists in the Department than there are Communists. I do not think there are any Communists at heart there. There may be some men who believe in progressive legislation, who have the interests of the country at heart, who are mistakenly labeled as "pinks" or Communists, which of course does not appeal to some of my Republican friends. Nevertheless, he has been censored and I presume will be again in the general debate as I have said, unfairly and unjustly.

Criticism will also be directed, I presume, at the Department of Justice. Why? Because the Attorney General of that Department has started prosecutions against some of the trusts or combines which are taking advantage of the Nation and the country and its people in many ways. They are trying to bring to justice those violators of the law who, for their own enrichment, have evaded the law.

The Secretary of Commerce also may be censored. I myself might be in a position perhaps to find fault with the Secretary of Commerce, but I feel he is doing what he believes is right. I think each and every one of these men in charge of these departments is a capable, honest, sincere American, and decides to do what he believes is right for the country and for its people. But of course some people love to criticize. It is easier to tear down than to build up.

I do not desire to call attention to some of the shortcomings and misdeeds of some of the Republican officeholders in years gone by. I could justly spend half of the 6 hours in calling the attention of the American people to some of the matters passed on by Republicans in office that may be rightly questioned, of their short-sighted policies, they always having the interest of the vested interests at heart instead of the interests of the people. Mr. Speaker, in view of the 6 hours that will be allowed for general debate in which all matters contained in the bill will be discussed pro and con and fault found with and criticism made of many of its provisions, I shall conclude these remarks in order that other Members may have the opportunity to find fault again and unjustly and unfairly criticize and smear some outstanding men who are serving our country at this time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we have before us today contains $100,000,000 for the Voice of America. I rise at this time because I want to discuss the Voice and to establish what the attitude of Republican Members of the House is on this program. I have talked with many Members, I have heard their opinions, and I have weighed their views. I do not profess to speak for every single Member, but I think the Republican position can pretty well be summed up as follows:

First. Republicans are for a program such as is envisioned by the Voice of America. It was the Republican Eightieth Congress which enacted the enabling legislation setting up the Voice of America.

Second. The overwhelming majority of Republican Members are distressed at the results which have been obtained by the operation of the Voice. They regard the idea as a sound one, but they contend the execution of the idea by the administration has been an almost complete failure.

Third. It appears to be a belief of most of my colleagues that the greatest single handicap suffered by the Voice is the fact that the administration has no foreign policy worthy of the name. There is the additional thought that even if

there was a firm policy in existence, the present methods and the present personnel of the Voice would still cause the program to fail.

I want to examine the whole problem of the Voice of America today with a view to seeing what this House should do about it. We are faced with the question of whether a program that is a conceded failure should be continued at all, continued in part, or continued without any curtailment whatsoever.

Let me deal for a few minutes with what might be called an ideal propaganda program.

The first requisite for such a program would be a firm, clear-cut foreign policy. For example, suppose such a policy called for opposing communism wherever and whenever it achieves control or threatens to achieve control in any part of the world. That in itself would not be a complete foreign policy, but it certainly would be a vital element of a foreign policy—it would be a foundation, so to speak, for a comprehensive policy. It certainly would be closer to a policy than anything we have today.

Operating under such a basic premise, any information or propaganda program could then take the offensive fearlessly and without equivocation.

With such a sound foundation under this foreign policy, the administrators of the program would then feel free to establish a staff of experts on communism who would be qualified by nature of background and by previous experience in or with the Communist conspiracy to develop the correct psychological approach in the battle for the minds of men.

With anticommunism as the hard core of our policy, the propaganda program would then have a true objective. That objective would be to expose communism to the peoples of the world and to show what it has done wherever it has existed. The objective would also include assurances to the various peoples of the world that America stood ready to help them throw off the burden of communism.

It naturally follows that if we were to have such a program, we would want to employ personnel completely familiar with the characteristics peculiar to each nation to which we were addressing ourselves. It is self-evident that you do not approach the mind of a Frenchman in the same manner in which you approach the mind of a Mongolian.

The directing officials of such a program would of necessity have to be brilliant, resourceful, imaginative people with a complete understanding of the Communist conspiracy and possessing the mental courage and know-how to fight it by propaganda and psychological warfare.

In addition, the program would have to be closely coordinated with the other operations of our Government at the policy-making level, including the military and the diplomatic branches.

It is not necessary for me to tell the House that we have no such program today, or that we are not going to have such a program until there is a drastic change in the personnel of the executive branch of our Government. Yet we are faced with the question of whether an unspeakably poor Voice of America is better than no Voice of America at all.

The fundamental disease which infects this administraiton is timidity, aggravated by an ailment which, for want of a better word, I will describe as reformitis.

This administration basks in the naive belief that the way to fight communism is to reform somebody. There is no comprehension of the fundamental fact that the Communist conspiracy is not based on a successful ideology, but on the use of force, terror, and untruth. There is absolutely no comprehension of the essential fact that Communists do not come into control by winning majorities; they have never won a popular election in the entire history of communism. On the contrary, they have seized power in every instance through the use of force or infiltration by a tightly knit minority which ruthlessly destroyed lives, property, and truth to achieve control by methods no different than those employed by the Capone gang in Chicago in their heyday of infamy.

Chicago did not get rid of the Capone gangsters by passing wage-hour laws, building little TVA's, instituting land reforms, or borrowing money from Uncle Sam. The way to get rid of gangsters is to meet them head on at the scene of their crime and convict them in a court of law and in the court of public opinion.

Gangsterism does not prey on bad people and grant immunity to good people. Neither does communism. If this administration ever understands that fundamental fact, we may start winning against the world Communist conspiracy instead of suffering defeat after defeat.

Yet this administration, from top to bottom, is imbued with this reformitis and the timidity which goes with it hand in hand.

The Voice of America is headed by a young man named Edward W. Barrett, who enjoys the title of Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Mr. Barrett is probably an estimable gentleman who comes from a good family, went to a good school, and held jobs in the journalistic field which were above reproach. However that may be, the facts are that Mr. Barrett is part and parcel of this fuzzy-minded, timid cabal to which I refer.

I hold in my hand a copy of Pathfinder magazine dated December 13, 1950. The cover on this magazine is a picture of Mr. Barrett, and the caption beneath it reads "The man with 42 voices." Within the covers of this magazine there are four pages devoted to a story about Mr. Barrett and the operations of the Voice of America which he directs. On page 21 of this issue Mr. Barrett is quoted as follows:

> Today we're building the machinery for keeping the world informed, but the basis of that information must still be "acting right." If we can engineer some land reforms in southeast Asia and help promote real economic improvement, it'll be worth 20 divisions to us, or maybe 20 radio stations.

I do not know whether our troops in Korea ever read Mr. Barrett's statement in Pathfinder magazine or not, but I would say that Mr. Barrett's comprehension of how to reach the minds of men is laid bare in his words that I have just quoted.

I can imagine the psychological impact of Mr. Barrett's words on a weary, grimy, fatigued GI, knee deep in a rice paddy in Korea, facing Communist bullets, artillery fire, and aerial strafing, when he heard that a little bit of land reform would be worth 20 divisions.

I am sure any GI would have told Mr. Barrett that he would take the 20 divisions and let Mr. Barrett and this administration keep their land-reform programs.

But more important than the impact of such a fuzzy-minded concept on our troops in Korea is the fact that these words thoroughly and completely reflect the disease which infects this administration from top to bottom.

We tried land reforms, loans, wage-hour edicts, and the whole list of New Deal and Fair Deal panaceas in South Korea from 1945 until 1950. Our State Department told the world we were making South Korea "the showcase of democracy." Those were the exact words the State Department used.

We said to the South Koreans: "No, you cannot have guns, even though the Soviet Union is giving your northern brothers guns, planes, and tanks. You South Koreans must be so nice and so good no one will dare attack you. You will be an example for the world, and when everybody sees your example, the Communist leaders all over the world will roll over dead, mortified into oblivion by the splendid example you are making."

Yes, we even pulled our troops out of South Korea in the summer of 1949, just 1 year before the shooting started. The South Koreans begged us for arms, but this administration refused to let them have them. The South Koreans were given land reform and wage-hour laws, and the North Koreans received guns and bullets. I will leave it to your judgment whether our over-all total of 150,000 casualties in the current Korean conflict are sufficient evidence that our dreamboat policy in South Korea was incredibly stupid.

And yet, 6 months after the Korean war had started, Mr. Edward W. Barrett, who runs the Voice of America, was still prating about land reforms in southeast Asia being worth more than 20 divisions.

God help us.

Now let me read more from this incredible Mr. Barrett, who seems to have trouble deciding whether land reforms are worth more than 20 divisions or more than 20 radio stations. He goes on to say in the interview in Pathfinder magazine:

> That's why I'm pretty happy about the psychological strategy board. It's composed of the top men from the Joint Chiefs, Defense, ECA, Central Intelligence, National Security Resources Board, and State, with me as chairman. Meets once a week, usually. The next one will be over at my house, where we can take off our coats and tackle the real problems of planning coordinated programs overseas so we get the maximum impact on the most people.

Down through the New Deal and Fair Deal years I have heard a great deal about the brain-trust salons, the intellectual soirees, and the pink-teacup conclaves of the mental giants of the administration in Washington. We are told it is at these affairs where all the advanced thinking is done and the master plans are made.

For 30 years we have been hearing a great deal about smoke-filled rooms at political conventions, but I want to say to this House that the fundamental institutions of America have undergone a throusand times greater damage from the intellectual soirees in the fog-filled rooms of Washington during these last 18 years.

There is something just too precious about these cozy little meetings at the homes of members of this psychological strategy board, whatever that is. What these gentlemen had better do is put on their coats and get out of Washington before they have completely wrecked this great country of ours with their foggy, vaporous thinking.

I have made considerable study of the operations of the Voice of America, as have many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I am distressed that the Voice of America has accomplished so little and failed so often.

I have received many comments, both good and bad, about the Voice of America. I have received letters from many parts of the world telling me of the effect or the lack thereof of the Voice in the writer's particular country. I have discussed the Voice with numerous high officials of various governments, including our own Government.

The consensus of opinion is that the best thing which can be said about the Voice of America is that it is incredibly dull and boring. It is without imagination. It wanders aimlessly from program to program. It lacks a cohesive idea or ideas. No one is sure exactly what it is trying to do. Only a mere handful profess to see any good coming from it as it now operates.

I shall not attempt here today to array all the facts I have in my possession concerning the Voice of America. I know that others will take the floor to cover many of the points I could make. Therefore, I shall cite only a few examples of the low opinion in which the Voice is held wherever you check anywhere in the world.

The chief criticism—and it is almost uniformly mentioned wherever Americans travel—is that the peoples of the world are fed up with being told how great America is. They are sick of seeing endless State Department propaganda picture books crammed full with fat and jolly American faces. The peoples of the world are already very much aware that we think very highly of ourselves, for very few of them have escaped the experience of encountering American travelers who swaggered and boasted as they traveled.

From what I can deduce, most Europeans and Asiatics are not so much interested in our own material success as they are concerned with what Uncle Sam is going to do about the threat of communism. And need I add that the Voice seldom supplies an answer?

The House will not be surprised, I am sure, to learn from my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] that a high proportion of the millions of pamphlets and magazines being published under our information program, end up in waste baskets. For example, the gentleman from Nebraska has told us that thousands of copies of a magazine entitled "Eight Great Americans" are lying in embassy basements all over the world because the reading matter is not acceptable to local populations. I might add that these magazines cost 8 cents each to produce.

As for the news broadcasts of the Voice of America itself, the opinion is almost universal that there is entirely too much boasting about American living standards, American luxuries, and American big heartedness, and that when straight news reporting is attempted, it appears to be written for consumption by the American public and not the foreign audience for which it is intended.

In addition, the give-away complex which infects this administration is reflected in the Voice of America, which constantly tells foreign audiences about the wonderful things that we are doing for them in the way of loans and assistance programs, without explaining the terrific sacrifices required on the part of the American people.

It is little wonder that the average European thinks he is doing us a favor by accepting our unwanted agricultural surpluses. Why should not the average European be suspicious when this administration is constantly telling the American people we are growing richer day by day through giving away our substance and spending billions upon billions of borrowed dollars on questionable projects?

And why should not foreigners put their tongues in their cheeks when the Federal Government boasts that the American people have accumulated $168,000,000,000 in savings in the 10-year period ending December 31, 1949, without telling them that during this same period the administration added $218,000,000,000 to the Federal debt? No wonder the Communist propagandists quote these administration statistics on savings to prove Americans became rich from the war.

These gentlemen who meet in Washington's fog-filled drawing rooms might do better to consider the truthful propaganda line that Americans have shown themselves of capital needed for new factories, new homes, new highways, and new industrial equipment so that we could go steadily deeper into debt and export our goods abroad as gifts.

The administration insists its information and propaganda program is aimed at winning friends and influencing people. Mr. Barrett should learn what any press agent can tell you; you don't win friends by boasting how rich you are.

I am certain the House is well acquainted with the fact that despite some pretty fanciful figures from the State Department, the Voice has a very small listening audience throughout the world. The penetration in Russia is virtually nil, for, as one of my friends said recently, when the Voice of America comes on, you can hear the radio switches clicking off all over Europe.

We know the Russians are jamming the Voice and that very little of it is heard by the Russian people. The publication Amerika, which is supposed to be circulated in Russia, is still printed in large numbers despite the fact that only a fraction of the copies reach the Russian people and the rest are returned to us.

I want to quote to you from a dispatch to the New York Herald Tribune from London by that newspaper's correspondent there, Joseph Newman, a former Moscow correspondent:

> Only a tiny fraction of Voice broadcasts get through to the Soviet Union, and there is no way of knowing how many persons receive that precious tiny fraction. From time to time the American authorities get word that someone in Moscow, Kiev, Irkutsk, or some other remote region of Russia has clearly heard a Voice broadcast. For lack of anything better, such scraps of information are used as the basis for optimistic claims which are probably intended to impress Congress at a time when additional financial support is necessary.

People overseas constantly claim that the Voice is beamed at them using announcers and narrators who do not speak the native tongue so as to be effectively and clearly understood. The complaint is frequent that the programs show no comprehension of local conditions and local problems and offer virtually no solution as to how America intends to meet the Communist menace.

In other words, it offers these people no hope.

Those of us who have taken the trouble to read the scripts used on the Voice of America find them almost uniformly impressed with the fact they are dull and uninteresting. They are just plain boring. They have no life, no sparkle, no imagination. A person would have to be desperate for entertainment to turn to such radio fare.

Perhaps it would be correct to attribute the failure of the Voice to too much Barrett, too much boredom, and too much baloney.

On the broader front of over-all policy, there can be no disputing the fact that the loss of American confidence in the State Department exists the world over. There is little faith in a program such as the Voice of America when for the first 7 months of the Korean war, according to information reaching me, the role of Russia in that conflict was not mentioned a single time on the Voice. Nor can the peoples of the world, any more than the American people, understand how for five long years we could encourage the Communists in Asia while presumably discouraging them in Europe.

In short, few believe a program which is frankly the voice of Acheson can be the Voice of America. And who can blame them?

What should this House do about the pending appropriations?

The Voice, in its first year, received an appropriation of $20,937,347.

In its second year the appropriation was $31,100,000.

In its third year it was $47,300,000.

In its fourth year it was $70,500,000, with an additional $50,000,000 for capital investment.

Now, as it starts its fifth year, we have an appropriations bill presented to the House giving the Voice program $85,000,000, plus $15,000,000 carry-over, on the capital investment program—$100,000,000 in all to finance a conceded failure.

This is a temptation to say we should abolish the program.

I feel that would be a mistake. I am convinced most of my colleagues feel the same way. But we certainly do need to improve the product.

Unfortunately, I can see no way to improve the product so long as it remains in the hands of the present administration. The most we can hope to do is keep the framework of the Voice of America, and to pray we may soon evolve a firm foreign policy and a resolute program, administered by experts who have definite objectives and sound methods for achieving them.

But I can see no justification for maintaining any more than the framework until such a fortunate day is reached. We should keep the Voice on the air, but I am convinced the organization should be completely shaken up, the fat fried out of it, and the bureaucratic blunderings eliminated.

I wish to commend to this House the idea that it would be a decided waste of money to shut the Voice down completely, but it would be an equal waste of money to give the Voice $100,000,000 this year. Therefore, I am prepared, and I think my colleagues feel the same as I do, to vote to reduce this appropriation to a figure more commensurate with the meager results we are now obtaining from the Voice.

I would also like to recall that in the Eightieth Congress the House set up an Air Policy Board which made a study of requirements for a balanced program of air power. Time has proven the recommendations of that Board sound and far ahead of the thinking of the administration in power. So I urge the House to consider the possibility of setting up a similar committee on the subject of psychological warfare and effective propaganda abroad. If the administration will not move, then it is up to the Congress to act.

There is no need of endlessly sending good money after bad. We should cut this appropriation to a far more reasonable figure than has been reported by the Appropriations Committee, and, if the administration fails to improve the Voice of America, then the Congress should proceed immediately on a study of policy and program.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. The gentleman during the Eightieth Congress was a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and doubtless recalls that at that time our committee made a rather exhaustive investigation of the activities of the Voice of America with particular regard to their scripts. I wonder if the gentleman could inform me whether there has been any improvement of the scripts from those that were being used in 1948 and 1949?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I desire to be absolutely fair about it. If I remember correctly, although I am not sure of the exact time, we did exhibit here on the floor some of the scripts, copies of some of the things which were said, as well as some of the other propaganda that had been put out. As a result there was some stoppage, or some correction, of some of the more evident slanted propaganda in favor of one political party or some group of political candidates.

But as an over-all venture or activity certainly the Voice of America programs as of today are still very ineffective. They are still not meeting the requirements of this Nation, and are not doing the job that we want it to do abroad, and for that reason I have suggested that we must take steps to correct the present situation.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I just want to make this observation: That it was my experience during a trip with a select committee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in 1949 to be behind the iron curtain and talk with the citizens of two of those countries, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Their general reaction to the Voice of America was certainly that at best it was not contributing any constructive good so far as we were concerned; and in the main they felt that we were just failing to reach our objective and that most of our effort was wasted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is still happening throughout the world. In recent years it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of any straight-thinking American that the Voice has not given to the world the true American picture as to our position in world affairs, nor has it accomplished much toward getting world peace for which we had hoped and prayed it would.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, as a consistent but constructive critic for some time past of the operations of the so-called Voice of America program I want to say that I have listened carefully to the very carefully prepared and mimeographed political speech of the gentleman from Ohio, and I find that he is as expertly misinformed as usual.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness to Assistant Secretary Barrett I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at this point the full Pathfinder news magazine article referred to by the gentleman from Ohio in his remarks just made.

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

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

EDWARD W. BARRETT CARRIES AMERICA'S CASE TO BOTH SIDES OF THE IRON CURTAIN

(This country has two principal voices—the Voice of America radio and the less-tangible voice of a free country, raised against the clamor of Red propaganda. Associate Editor Beverley M. Bowie reports on the man whose job is to talk to the world.)

JUNE 25, 1950

In the passageway outside the Assistant Secretary's office the news ticker reels out an endless ribbon of bad news: North Korean tanks, backed by infantry, have crossed the thirty-eighth parallel and are smashing southward toward Seoul. The names of lost towns curl upon the floor, unread and unremarked. For within the conference room have gathered the men who must counter the impact of such bulletins upon Asia and the West: the directors of the State Department's global network of information.

Tense, a bit disheveled (the news has tumbled them from Sunday morning snoozes), they hammer out the main line which all United States Government media, press, radio, and films, will take. No need to concoct anything fancy—the truth will carry a dockside wallop. It is the United Nations which has been attacked. It is the U. N. spearheaded by the United States, which defends the free world against aggression.

But speed is essential, for already the forewarned propaganda mills of Moscow are pouring out their topsy-turvy version of the Korean conflict. State's first move is to alert its Public Affairs staffmen in every country. Normally no bulletins go out on Sunday; today, by 3 p. m., full stories on the U. N. position are broadcast to each Far Eastern post and to major posts in the Near and Middle East, Europe, and Latin America.

Minutes after Truman announces the commitment of American planes, the Voice of America begins to beam 6 hours of steady programing in Korean, Mandarin, Cantonese, and slow English, blanketing the peninsula. Despite jamming by the Soviets, the text of the President's message is rocketed through the iron curtain in round-the-clock broadcasts, the negotiations are begun with France, Italy, England, Turkey, and Greece to step up the pressure-by-air on the U. S. S. R.

VOICE IN THE FIELD

Out in the field, United States information officers, running the gantlet from Seoul to Taejon, set up an impromptu news center. Daily bulletins posted on its walls are scanned eagerly by tens of thousands of Koreans. From its roof a loudspeaker brays four newscasts a day to soldiers, refugees, citizens. Three mobile units jounce over the country roads, distributing leaflets and telling the U. N.'s story over public-address systems. State experts assigned to MacArthur's psychological warfare unit help Army coworkers prepare leaflets aimed at five groups: ROK troops, South Korean civilians, enemy troops, North Korean civilians, farmers in overrun areas. Bombers are assigned to drop them by the million.

Back in Washington, State's motion-picture division puts together two realistic documentaries on Korea, rushes 1,100 prints in 26 languages all over the world. To follow it up, the press division begins a cartoon book, the Korea Story, scheduling 450,000 copies in English, more in Burmese, Arabic, Persian.

For a week the broadcasters, scriptmen, pamphleteers, and film men stay on the job day and night. For another fortnight they are on call at any hour. Not until the informational machine settles down for the long haul do they slack off to a 12-hour day, a 6-day week.

TOP BRASS

Key commander in this vast and intricate operation—in itself only one skirmish in the current world-wide battle for men's minds—Edward Ware Barrett, the chunky, hard-driving, 40-year-old executive who is Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

Last week Barrett summed up what his cohorts accomplished in those first, furious days: "The situation was this: South Koreans and Americans were being pushed right down the peninsula. The Cominform was spending millions to convince the world that we were aggressors. All over Asia and Europe our enemies were gloating, our friends were quaking. We had to do three things, quickly: Get the Commies tagged by world opinion as the aggressors they were; isolate them by driving it home that 53 nations were against them, and identify the U. N. cause with that of freemen everywhere. We—and our allies—did it. We had the facts to back us up. We could even use our near-disaster to advantage—to show we obviously couldn't have planned aggression. Propaganda-wise, it was a victory.

"Don't misunderstand me. Information didn't do it alone—by any means. If the U. N. hadn't acted quickly and boldly, and if MacArthur's forces hadn't recovered so magnificently, we would have got nowhere. But, on the other hand, if information hadn't rammed home the significance of our action to every last hut and hamlet, the Russians, with their barrage of defeatism and confusion, might have cracked the moral unity of the democratic world."

Barrett could be wrong. But he believes what he says. And he has, in his Office of International Information, a propaganda weapon more formidable than any the reluctant Republic has ever fashioned. It may not perform the miracles its creators fondly expect. But that it exists at all is a minor miracle.

Long after every European country had seen the need of an agency to divide its enemies and unite its friends, the United States, delicately pinching its nose at the vulgar aroma of propaganda, refused to set up an information service of its own.

In World War I, Woodrow Wilson permitted the establishment of George Creel's blundering Committee of Public Information. In World War II, Franklin Roosevelt created—and thereafter ignored—the Office of War Information. But after each fracas, the rush to demobilize swept such organizations into the scrap basket.

MAKESHIFT

Three years ago, picking up where OWI left off, State patched together a rickety outfit designed to do much the same job. Run on a shoestring budget and headed by one-time advertising ace BILL BENTON (now Senator from Connecticut), the Office of Information had to content itself with putting across a full and fair picture of America for foreign consumption. "It was what the trade calls institutional advertising," says Barrett. Nice and necessary, but hardly enough for times like these.

Under its next director—career diplomat George V. Allen—the Office of Information fared no better. The most that Congress would vote its overworked, fanatically devoted little staff was $47,300,000—far less than OWI's wartime budget.

Barrett, taking office last February, brought new hope to the agency—and got it more money. Roused at last by the propagandistic fury of Russia's "peace offensive," Congress tardily decided to ante up: The Joint Office of International Information and Educational Exchange got $32,700,000 in September, $79,000,000 more 3 weeks later.

FEEDING THE STEPCHILD

That still added up to less than the U. S. S. R. spends on information, less than the Navy would pay for one supercarrier, and only about what the United States tobacco industry allots for promotion and advertising. But at least we were raising the status of United States information from emaciated stepchild to participant in the council's of Government.

To State's psychological warriors the additional money looked good. Barrett looked even better. Benton, they reasoned, had known all about public relations, not much about Government. Allen had known all about bureaucracy, not much about the media of promotion. Barrett—a veteran of OWI and editorial director of a news magazine—would combine in one person the skills of both worlds.

By and large, Barrett appears to have lived up to expectations. Says one staff member: "Only man we've ever had around here who can keep an eye on all the jumping beans in this fantastic operation." Says another: "Wonderful to work for a man who can do any job in the shop as well—or better—than the guy who's sitting there." The theme song of Barrett's staff seems to be: Anything we can do, he can do better.

ON THE DOUBLE

Barrett, in brief, is primarily an operator. Such thinking as he expends on the philosophy of the program he does on the run or at long evening and Saturday planning sessions. Months ago he made up his mind what kind of an information job he wanted State to do; now he hustles up and down the corridors seeing that the job gets done. It's a rare employee who doesn't look up once in a while to find Barrett peering intently over his shoulder.

It may be that Barrett comes naturally by his capacity to carry off difficult situations. His father, editor of Alabama's Birmingham Age-Herald, once played dominoes all evening with circus owner John Ringling, ended by betting him the family car against an elephant.

"At 5:30 a. m.," recalls Barrett, "the editor of the Age-Herald arrived home complete with elephant and mahout. Somehow or other, my mother wasn't very keen about asking them in. So father stored the elephant in the family garage and went to bed. Next morning the elephant was still there—but not the front doors or the rear end of the garage.

"Boy. We kids had a time that day. We gave rides to half the neighborhood. But my father finally had to face the question: What was he going to do with the beast? The circus had moved in. And the Birmingham market for full-grown elephants was far from brisk.

"Well, he went down to the office and meditated. Next morning the Age-Herald began a new editorial campaign. Its theme: 'Birmingham Needs a Zoo.' "

TIGER FROM B'HAM

Pulling up stakes at the age of 15, young Barrett went north to prep school, entered Princeton in 1928. There he cashed in on two qualities that were to stand him in good stead: An ability to run and to write. His first year, he made both the freshman track team and the Daily Princetonian, which he later edited.

Plunging into the newspaper field during its leanest years, Barrett continued to chalk up mileage as a reporter for the Birmingham News, as Washington correspondent for Newsweek, as staffman for Today, and back to Newsweek as associate editor. By 1939 he had acquired a wife (Mason Daniel, of Jacksonville, Fla.) and a mild reputation as one of the Nation's most strenuous journalists.

Had he joined the Armed Forces, it is quite possible he would have legged it into Paris ahead of even Ernest Hemingway. As it was, he trotted down to Washington to help start the Office of the Coordinator of Information, shifted to OWI's Cable-Wireless Division, became chief of its Overseas News and Features Bureau, went over to the Mediterranean to serve 6 months with Allies' Psychological Warfare Branch, then returned to take over direction of OWI's Overseas Branch from playwright Robert E. Sherwood.

After the war Barrett withdrew to New York to become Newsweek's editorial director. But, through his membership in the Council on Foreign Relations and his trusteeship in the Institute of International Education, he kept one eye cocked on information activities in the Capital. When the bid finally came from Truman, Barrett was not too surprised.

HARASSED CHAUFFEUR

Settling into his job, Barrett discovered its chief occupational affliction: he had become the chauffeur of a bus with a Nation-load of back-seat drivers. "There isn't a man on the streets of Washington," he mutters, "who doesn't know how to run the information program better than I do. And every other man eventually tells me so. Now and then we get a good idea this way. But they catch me at the office; they catch me at home. At a party, I can hardly take two steps toward a cocktail without being buttonholed by somebody with a brand-new gimmick to outwit and befuddle the enemy. It's fine, you know, all this interest. Very healthy, and all that. But sometimes——"

To sandwich a little work in between these bouts of advice, Barrett gets to the office at 8:30, doesn't quit until at least 7, works all day Saturday. Deprived of his golf and swimming, he finds even his mile-a-day jaunts down State's halls insufficient. Wryly he admits: "I do setting-up exercises in the bathroom now, for Pete's sake."

Sundays, Barrett tries to catch up on his sleep. He has brought no elephants home to his two young daughters; but he hammers away with them at a sort of pygmy elephant hut in the back yard, in which the family's new black-and-white cocker spaniel will reside.

MOVE ON, PLEASE

Assistant Secretaries of State don't rate being driven to work in an official car. Barrett, though he recently acquired a 1950 Buick, usually careens down to Foggy Bottom in a beat-up 11-year-old Chevrolet which, he says, "has the general contours of a phone booth." The first time he tried to park it in the space reserved for top officials, the guard thought he was an impostor.

Feet on his vast mahogany desk, the Assistant Secretary talked readily enough last week about his post and its problems, with only an occasional nervous squint at the clock. "Listen," he drawled, "before I ever came down here the powers-that-be readily agreed to one thing; that I wasn't going to run any mimeograph mill just cranking out stories to justify decisions already reached. I feel any declaration of foreign policy, any step we take abroad, is going to affect the attitudes of other nations toward America. Which is Information's province. So Information should be able to chip in its 2 cents before those moves are made."

Taking off his spectacles, Barrett grinned looking more than ever like a cautiously elated boy elected mayor-for-a-day. I must say we've got swell cooperation, all up and down the line. One Information man sits in on the key meetings, beginning with Secretary Acheson's at 9:30 every morning. The top command and the regional assistant secretaries now work with us in a grand way. What's more important, maybe, we have Public Affairs officers and staffs assigned to each of State's geographical divisions. They work right along with the political desks, keep us in touch with their day-to-day decisions, and keep them in touch with ours.

"Frankly, we have a fine team. My deputy, Howland Sergeant, was a top-flight wartime administrator with good international experience. Charles Hulten, our general manager, is a former newspaperman with a stand-out reputation in Government. Joe Phillips, our planning coordinator, was a distinguished foreign correspondent and editor. Foy Kohler, chief of the Voice, is a top-rank

Russian expert and a good manager. And we have dozens of crack newsmen, radiomen, and education experts."

Barrett strode thoughtfully across the room to another chair, flopped in it. "The guts of the matter is this," he stated. "No information program is worth any more than the foreign policy it is based on. Look at the Commies. They set up this big peace offensive. They collect millions of signatures all over the world. They yell about the wicked, war-loving Americans and their nasty atom bomb. And it works, after a fashion. Then what do the Commies do? Pull the plug on the whole program by pushing the North Koreans into clear-cut aggressions."

EXPERT ADVICE

The telephone on Barrett's desk buzzed. He glared at it, ignored it. "It is as true of nations as of human beings: We are judged more by what we do than by what we say. People seem to think psychological warfare is just talking at people, or showing them pictures. It is not. An old expert once said: 'Good public relations is just acting right and letting people know about it.' For a long time we acted pretty well but did not bother to make our actions and our motives known. Today we are building the machinery for keeping the world informed, but the basis of that information must still be acting right. If we can engineer some land reforms in southeast Asia and help promote real economic improvement, it will be worth 20 divisions to us, or maybe 20 radio stations—though we will need a few to keep our actions from being misinterpreted.

"That's why I'm pretty happy about this Psychological Strategy Board. It's composed of the top men from the Joint Chiefs, Defense, ECA, Central Intelligence, National Security Resources Board, and State, with me as Chairman. Meets once a week, usually. The next one will be over at my house, where we can take off our coats and tackle the real problems of planning coordinated programs overseas so we get the maximum impact on the most people."

Barrett cupped his chin in his hands, glanced out the window at an industrious pigeon on the sill. "That's at the top echelon, of course. Below it the Board has a permanent staff drawing up long-term plans for the kind of psychological warfare America must wage if and when the shooting begins. Can't say much about that, of course." Asked to appraise the success of the information program so far, Barrett scratched his chin judiciously. "You might describe what we've done to date as a holding action. And we haven't always had enough ammunition, or even the right kind. We've sent mobile film units up into the hills of India—showing what? Sometimes a film made for Europe—and not too useful for Indians."

The Barrett fist thudded into the Barrett palm. "That's past history. Now we've got the funds, we're designing every program to hit a specific target group. We're outfitting ourselves with rifles, not shotguns. And we're going to take a lot of the masterminding and the sharpshooting out of Washington and put it where it belongs—in the missions overseas. They're in a much better position than we to decide exactly what works best with the local audience.

"But you've got to realize what we're up against. Take the people in the satellite nations and in the U. S. S. R. There's no point in telling them what scoundrels the Commies are; they know it at first-hand. Not much point, either, in telling them what angels we are; anybody would look better to them than their present masters. And there's even less point in urging them to rise and man the barricades; they'd just get one-way tickets to the concentration camp. It's better to feed them a steady, sustaining diet of the truth, convince them that time fights on the side of freedom—in short, strengthen their will to hang on and, perhaps, to drag their feet."

VOICE OF GERMANY

Grabbing a sheaf of papers from his desk, Barrett thumbed through them, "Listen to this," he said happily. "This is the kind of thing I mean. Here's a German who wrote us after he'd returned from 4 years as a prisoner of war in Russia. He was a radio man—built a public-address system for the camp. He says: 'Your direct-beaming Station Munich is received in the U. S. S. R. with excellent quality, stability and security, at all times of the day or year. Jamming from the Russians is at least 50 percent unsuccessful. * * * There is no one who owns a radio (rather many people now) who does not know and listen to your transmissions. Even the highest chiefs of police don't mind saying how happy they are to listen again to London or America. I was often called out of bed at night in order to tune in the western stations for the officers.'

"Here's another one. A fellow writes us about the punishments the Russians inflict on anybody in Siberia tuning in the Voice of America. 'But everybody listens,' he says. 'The commander of a concentration camp listens, the director of a plant listens, the chairman of a collective farm listens. And if they listen, other people do the same or learn the news from them. People young and old listen. They meet in groups, post guards, and later spread the news everywhere.'

"Letters like that keep flooding in to our program evaluation branch—30,000 a month—from all parts of the globe. You never realize what a precious commodity truth is until you hear half the world crying out for it."

CRITICS

The phone rang insistently, stopped. Barrett went on: "I've got 42 voices, you might say—that's the number of languages we use in getting our program across to the world. But if I had 84, I couldn't guarantee we'd make everybody love us Americans.

"It's a funny thing about our critics, though. They tend to contradict each other. One bunch beats us over the head because the Voice is 'too pussyfooting,' or 'too pedantic,' or 'too dependent on the news.' The other gang jumps us for getting too propagandistic and nonobjective. Well, they're both right—to this extent: We're trying now to mix up our programs—half firm, honest news and half hard-hitting messages, clearly labeled as such."

This time, the phone would not be denied. Barrett picked it up, said "Yes" politely three times. "No," once, and put it down. "Mind you," he said, "the people on the Hill have been swell, most of them. The one fellow we've had real trouble with is a distinguished gentleman who keeps telling his fellow politicians that, after a profound study of the Voice of America, he's concluded it's no good.

"I went up there to chat with him. He admitted to me that, though he'd looked through some of our scripts, he hadn't heard a Voice broadcast in 4 years. I invited him to drop by the studios and attend some shows. He thanked me—and never came. But he goes right on yelling about the rotten job we're doing."

CALCULATED RISK

Grinning ruefully, Barrett rose. "We can take it," he said. "And we'll have to get used to taking it a lot more. Because we're not going to play supersafe and cautious. We're going to stick our necks out, and we're bound to make a few mistakes. We may get our heads bashed in now and then but * * *"

He held open the door. Glancing at the crowded antechamber, he winced, half-closed the door again. "I'll tell you: when I first brought my family down here, I beefed to a colleague because we'd found a house but couldn't get into it for three more months. He stared at me and said: "What makes you think you'll still be here in 3 months?"

"Well, that was 10 months ago, and I'm still here. So far, I guess, so good."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to take the well of this House and make general statements that are not supported by the facts. When anyone makes the statement that the Voice of America had not accomplished any good, that statement is inconsistent with the facts, as has been proven by the effort behind the iron curtain to see that the Voice of America is not heard. None of us are perfect.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not believe the gentleman from Massachusetts has correctly interpreted the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I think the gentleman said they had not accomplished much good.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman, who was on the Expenditures Committee with me, did make that statement. My reference was not to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HAYS or Ohio. It would seem rather queer if the Voice has been a complete failure behind the iron curtain that Russia would be spending millions, as much or even more than we are spending for the Voice, to jam it. If it is not reaching anybody why would they go to all that trouble to jam the Voice of America?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall make some remarks while this bill is under consideration presenting evidence in support of what I now say. The Soviet Union is spending at least $1,000,000,000 a year for propaganda purposes aimed at the free countries of the world and directly and ultimately at the United States of America. I think that statement answers the observation and inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] picked out a magazine article about Assistant Secretary Barrett and referred to one sentence in which there was something said or purported to have been said by Assistant Secretary Barrett in reference to land reform in other parts of the world. When the gentleman from Ohio was elaborating in his prepared statement, which is very unusual for him as he is one of the best extemporaneous speakers I have ever heard, my thoughts and my mind went back to the day that General MacArthur addressed this body.

I remember that on that occasion General MacArthur devoted a considerable part of his speech to land reform,

to social justice, and to the problems of meeting human suffering and distress in other countries of the world, particularly in the Near East, in the Middle East, and the Far East.

I obtained a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day to be sure that my recollection was correct. I remember as I sat on the floor of the House listening to General MacArthur—and I was one of those who agreed with his views and the intent that he had in mind from the humanitarian angle—I thought that if those words came from the lips of a Democrat instead of from the lips of General MacArthur, a great military leader who has made mistakes like all of us have made, some serious but who is a Republican in politics, we would be accused of world socialism or global WPA.

Now, let me refresh your memory as to some of the statements that General MacArthur made not so long ago, and as I read these statements the brief observation made by Assistant Secretary Barrett becomes minor in comparison with the views of General MacArthur.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to thank the gentleman and to congratulate him on referring to General MacArthur, especially in view of the fact that the Voice of America, on a number of its programs, has attempted to deprecate that which General MacArthur stated.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge of that and I would not approve of it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman would not.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge of it. I like to see the evidence and the proof, but, if that is so, I would agree with the gentleman in that respect. You gentlemen may offer the proof. I say if it is there I would agree with the gentleman in that respect.

Coming back to April 19, when General MacArthur was addressing a joint session in this Chamber, what were some of the things he said on that occasion?

> The Communist threat is a global one. Its successful advance in one sector threatens the destruction of every other sector.

Most of my Republican friends, by their votes, do not agree with that. He further said:

> Beyond pointing out these general truisms, I shall confine my discussion to the general areas of Asia. Before one may objectively assess the situation now existing there, he must comprehend something of Asia's past and the revolutionary changes which have marked her course up to the present. Long exploited by the so-called colonial powers, with little opportunity to achieve any degree of social justice—

How strange those words must sound to my friend from Ohio, and if Assistant Secretary Barrett had used these words, my friend, in his prepared remarks, would have been much more severe than he was by making slight reference to land reforms—

> with little opportunity to achieve any degree of social justice, individual dignity, or a higher standard of life—

Coming from General MacArthur, and I agree with that, that is perfect in the minds of most of my friends on the Republican side, but coming from a Democrat, why that would be subject to the most severe, discolored interpretation and criticism possible.

Then he further said:

> Mustering half of the earth's population and 60 percent of its natural resources, these peoples are rapidly consolidating a new force, both moral and material, with which to raise the living standard and erect adaptations of the design of modern progress to their own distinct cultural environments.

Let me go a little further and refresh your memory as to what General MacArthur said on that occasion:

> Their prewar standard of life, pitifully low, is infinitely lower now in the devastation left in war's wake. World ideologies play little part in Asian thinking and are little understood.

Let me call this to your attention:

> What the people strive for—

And he is referring to the people of Asia—

> What the people strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs—

Today, if that came from a Democrat, that would be misinterpreted and discolored: World socialism, global WPA, destroying the financial strength of our country. Oh, would not this Chamber be ringing with the speeches that would be prepared by the Republican National Committee or others condemning any Democrat or any official connected with the present administration who would dare use that language and express such thoughts?

> What the peoples strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs—

What did he further say?—

> a little better clothing on their backs, a little firmer roof over their heads, and the realization of a normal nationalist urge for political freedom. These political-social conditions have but an indirect bearing upon our own national security, but do form a backdrop to contemporary planning which must be thoughtfully considered if we are to avoid the pitfalls of unrealism.

It is all right for General MacArthur to call it "contemporary planning which must be thoughtfully considered if we are to avoid the pitfalls of unrealism" in connection with the people of Asiatic countries, but severe condemnation and criticism would be showered upon any Democrat who would dare use that kind of language or anything like it.

General MacArthur realizes that a powerful military is not the sole answer to the challenge of Asia. General MacArthur realizes that a powerful military is necessary, that it is necessary for the purpose of preserving our country in case of attack, in case of another global war. It is necessary as a possible deterrent to such an attack.

One thing General MacArthur impressed on my mind indelibly as a result of his address here on April 19 is that he recognizes that the only thing, as I have said repeatedly in this Chamber and outside this Chamber, that the Communists respect is what they fear, and the only thing they fear is power, material power greater than they possess themselves. But ours is not alone a material civilization, ours is a spiritual civilization. General MacArthur recognizes the power and the force of the moral influences upon men and women who believe as you and I do.

There are hundreds of millions of men and women throughout the world who believe as we do, not only outside the iron curtain but behind the iron curtain. There are countless millions of persons behind the iron curtain believing as we do who are looking for the day of deliverance, and they constitute in the day of crisis, if it comes, a real menace and a real weakness to the Communist dictators.

General MacArthur realizes that while we must be powerful from a military angle, and I agree with him, we believe in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God, and what we believe in is an affirmative way of life, not a negative or destructive way of life.

General MacArthur recognizes that the moral truth we believe in, the spiritual truths that are ours, whether we are Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, and we all believe in God, direct us to be affirmative, direct us not to be negative, direct us to try to accomplish within our means those things that constitute the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

When Mr. Barrett was talking about land reform he had that in mind. When General MacArthur referred to the people of Asia and the necessity for our doing something, some realistic contemporary planning that would help meet their economic problems within our limits and our powers, he recognized that that was carrying out a spiritual mission and performing a spiritual duty.

I think that Assistant Secretary Barrett, instead of being criticized for what he said, should be highly complimented. What he said was minor in comparison to what General MacArthur said in this very Chamber, and which we all applauded, his address to this joint session in this Chamber on April 19. I congratulate General MacArthur for what he said in connection with this, the forward-looking affirmative duty and responsibility that is ours. I compliment him. My friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] would not dare condemn or criticize General MacArthur for what he said, yet General MacArthur's statements were at least a thousand times broader than the limited observation made by Assistant Secretary Barrett in the article that appeared in the magazine that has been referred to.

I congratulate General MacArthur for what he said on this occasion on

April 19. I also congratulate Assistant Secretary Barrett for what he said.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to disagree with my good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], but on this fundamental issue I do not believe you can cure the ills of the Voice of America, and it probably has some, by cutting off that Voice. It is fundamental that the right way to cure a headache is not to cut off the head. I was interested in what the majority leader said and in what he read from the speech of General MacArthur, because it makes me think of one of the lessons I learned in grammar school, where they taught us that the three principal things that man must have to survive are food, clothing, and shelter.

To that I would like to add a fourth, and that is a freedom of spiritual being and the right to worship God as he pleases.

Mr. Speaker, I was behind the iron curtain with this select committee, with the gentleman from Indiana. I think he will agree that wherever we went there, and wherever we talked to the ordinary common people of those countries, and they found out we were Americans, we were welcome. They liked us. They liked us not as individuals, because they did not know us, but they liked us as Americans. They must have known something about America and Americans. I do not say they found it all out from the Voice of America. I think one of the potent sources of information to those people are from their friends and relatives who may have emigrated to this country and who are now in the second, third, and fourth generation. However, if the Voice of America helps even a little in keeping this friendship alive, it is worth while.

I pleaded when I made speeches back in Ohio for those people to keep in touch with their friends and relatives in Europe and to tell them about the conditions here and about what can happen to the basic needs of mankind in a democracy such as this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman stated that he disagrees with what I have said. I am sure he is sincere in expressing that disagreement. I wonder just what it is the gentleman disagrees with? Does he disagree with the statement I made that we should continue the Voice of America program? Does he think we should abandon it entirely?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. No; I think the gentleman knows wherein he and I disagree.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman agree with that statement which I made?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will tell you exactly where you and I disagree.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman disagree with that statement? I would like to know whether the gentleman disagrees with that statement or not?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

I disagree that we should cut off or trim down the funds of the Voice of America, because in my opinion there is a great job to be done. If what the gentleman says is true, and he has picked out a few isolated instances, and I say that the Voice is probably not perfect, the thing to do is to perfect it. We have the power and the authority here in Congress to do it and to make it possible for the Voice of America to do the job it should do.

But we cannot do that job by cutting off the Voice of America.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then the gentleman does agree with me that we should attempt to make it better?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Just how would you make it better, will you explain that to the House? Just what do you think we should do?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will answer that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I gave some ideas on that subject.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman did not give any concrete ideas. His speech was mostly criticism. Now I know my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] well enough to know that he is sincere and that he wants to improve the Voice of America. That can best be done by constructive criticism.

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I commend the gentleman and agree with him wholeheartedly in the statement that he has made as to our mutual experience. What he has said is entirely true. The friends we have behind the iron curtain are those who may have relatives here and, I might add, very thoughtful relatives here who have by their letters and by their gift packages and in many other ways manifested their affection for their homeland, and have built up for us friendships that are far greater than any that might be built in any other way to contribute to them.

In response to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I want to say it was not my intention to say that we should discontinue the Voice of America. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] misinterpreted me in saying that nothing could have come from the Voice of America. I did not intend to leave that impression, if I did.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I commend the gentleman and hope that there can be a meeting of minds on a constructive plane as to how we can best improve and make more effective our means of conveying to the world why and how democracy works in America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in a speech which I have made, several speeches of the Voice of America in the Bohemian language.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, are these the gentleman's own speeches?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the request to print them in the Bohemian language in the RECORD?

Mr. SABATH. I want the translated speech that I made to the Czechoslovakians printed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You are going to print them in English?

Mr. SABATH. Why, of course.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is only because of the attack of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], an eminent newspaper writer, editor, and publisher, against the Voice of America program, that I rise to state that I concede its work is not perfect, but we all know that there is nothing perfect under the sun. However, I am acquainted with some of the work of that organization as evidenced by the radio broadcasts made by several Members of the House to countries behind the iron curtain. I, myself, have made four such broadcasts to Czechoslovakia in my native language. I made the last broadcast only a few weeks ago and I feel it has done some good. It was beamed from an overseas station to Czechoslovakia where I am well known, having cooperated with the late President Thomas Masaryk in the early days of that country's independence and later with former President Eduard Benes who went into exile when the Communists took over the rule of that freedom-loving country.

I have frequently taken the floor to prevail upon the membership that our country should demonstrate to these people that a democratic form of government that gives freedom and opportunity to all, such as ours, is the best form of government that has ever been devised. In my broadcasts I have pleaded and urged these people to stand fast and to continue to fight in the hope that communistic control will be weakened and that it is but temporary, and not to surrender to communistic oppression.

Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America is rendering a real service with telling effect upon the countries behind the iron curtain, lending encouragement to those freedom-loving peoples in whose hearts the beacon light of liberty still fearlessly burns. Their only source of news of the outside world is through the medium of these broadcasts and they want to know the truth about the democracies' fight agains the Communist threat to the nations of the free world.

I do not wish to repeat the words of General MacArthur with respect to the subjugated peoples of the world, including those under the heel of communism, except to say that "a little more food in their stomachs, a little more clothing on their backs, a little more firmer roof over

their heads" will serve to eliminate communism more than military might. To those countries under the domination of Russian oppression, we can only give words of hope and comfort and the Voice of America is doing that job with stronger force every day. Shall we throttle or curtail the activities of such an agency whose effective work is becoming plainer and more evident every day, judging from the reports that are finding their way out from behind the iron curtain? I say "No," and I hope a majority of the membership will join me in keeping the appropriation intact, yes, that they will support an amendment to increase it.

Mr. Speaker, without taking up the further time of the House, I shall insert a translation in English of the broadcast which I made over radio station Munich on June 9, 1951. It is as follows:

ANNOUNCER. Representative SABATH, your name is widely known in Czechoslavakia since the first world war. During that war the Czech press wrote a great deal about the effective help you gave President Masaryk in his effort to free nationalities then under Hapsburg oppression. Could you give us a brief outline of your activity?

Mr. SABATH. Gladly. Soon after the outbreak of that war and as soon as Masaryk became recognized as the leader of the liberating movement, I began working among my colleagues in the Congress, through the American press, as well as through my contacts with President Wilson. I tried to bring about a better understanding of the worthiness of the Czechs for political freedom. At that time many nationalistic minorities sought American sympathy. So that Czech aims would receive full comprehension by the Congress and President Wilson, required endless effort on my part.

The end of the struggle daily became more apparent. The Germans were at a standstill on the French front. Austria-Hungary was beaten in Italy and Serbia. The Hapsburgs saw their finish and tried for a separate peace. President Wilson and the American public were absorbing their propaganda.

The opinion was that allied troops, freed of the Austrian front, would strengthen our armies in France. That way the end of German resistance would be hastened. I, however, feared that a precipitate peace with the Hapsburgs would create much harm and continue the subjection of the Czechs and the Slovaks.

When I stated this publicly I won very few supporters. Therefore I turned straight to President Wilson. At first he differed with me and expressed opposition. However, he did not disapprove entirely. After a second conference he promised that the question of peace with Austria-Hungary and independence for Czechoslovakia would not be decided by him prior to his further consideration of them with me. Soon afterward I was at the White House on other business. I was waiting to see the President in the reception room. His secretary, Mr. Tumulty, privately questioned me as to whether I came to talk about Czechoslovakia. I replied, "No"; that the subject of my visit was altogether different. Tumulty emphasized that since my previous visits President Wilson had been studying my point of view and that daily he was becoming more convinced that my position was right.

I welcomed that information and brought up the subject with the President once more. Mr. Wilson told me that he arrived at my opinion; that he had convinced himself that independence of Czechoslovakia and other subject nationalities must, in essence, become a part of the Allied peace terms. From that time on Mr. Wilson was very friendly toward the Czechoslovaks. Soon thereafter he proclaimed that condition to the world. Nevertheless, Austria-Hungary surrendered and the Czechoslovak Republic was recognized by the United States.

When Masaryk was returning from Vladivostok, across America to Czechoslovakia, some of his admirers tried to obtain an audience for him with President Wilson. Those efforts failed. As soon as I heard of it I intervened in Masaryk's behalf. I was convinced that a meeting between Masaryk and Wilson would result in agreement of two great minds. Although Wilson was burdened by momentous problems he listended to my account of Masaryk's understanding of European history and its political goals; that Masaryk was thoroughly versed in Slav and German aspirations; and that because he was a professor of philosophy he was especially talented in clear and convincing presentation of those subjects to the public; and that a welcome accorded Masaryk would inspire all the Slav people and especially the Slav volunteers and deserters who were joining allied forces on all fronts. In consequence Wilson granted the audience. Masaryk was received wholeheartedly and the two presidents spent several hours in conference. From the meetings of these two historical giants developed great benefits for Czech and Slovak peoples.

ANNOUNCER. Congressman SABATH, you also helped President Benes during World War II?

Mr. SABATH. Yes. As a matter of fact help was extended to President Benes by the entire United States.

Between the first and second World Wars the good will of the American people for Czechoslovakia reached its peak.

When Chamberlain sold you out to Hitler we in America were very deeply concerned. We hoped that your brave soldiers and your modern armament would punish the fascists effectively. But history states that that did not eventuate.

When President Benes came to the United States in 1943 again I tried to be helpful. He had a meeting with President Roosevelt, with Secretary of State Hull, and with other personages in the American Government. All of America respected you for your perseverence in opposing German barbarity.

There is no time on this radio period for me to tell about all the effort expended by the American people in behalf of Czechoslovakia. Suffice it to say that during the entire Second World War we Americans worked persistently, just like you did, so that Czechoslovakia again would attain its liberty. And, everywhere possible we supported your underground workers and activities.

ANNOUNCER. Do you think, Mr. SABATH, that the present subjugation of Czechoslovakia by the oppression of communism will endure?

Mr. SABATH. Just the reverse. I am sure that communism in Czechoslovakia as well as in other exploited nations is but temporary. I am sure that a nation which gave the world such great liberty-loving men as Hus, Masaryk, Macha, and Bezruc, never will surrender to oppression; and that it will destroy those who purloined power by intimidation and treachery. I am certain that no Czechoslovak will give up to a tyranny which denies him freedom of individual action and right to an independent existence. I am sure that the fantasy of absolute economic, political and social alikeness of all, preached by the inebriates of communism, is just as absurd to Czechoslovaks as it is to Americans.

Communism is not endowed with supernatural might entirely to remake a whole nation into an identic and fallacious pattern. Each human differs from every other human. Human individuality cannot be extirpated by communism and fraudulent promises. The personal ego is innate and threats, trickery, and violence cannot uproot it. Only a cringing serf or a cunning self-seeker will submit to an impracticable and mendacious communistic oligarchy. Had you wanted barbaric overlordship you should have retained the Hapsburgs.

We Americans are sure that you Czechoslovaks shall throw off the tyranny by which again you now are shackled. I am positive that you know the difference between the bastard democracy heralded by the Communists, in which you merely are exploited robots of terroristic overlords, and that democracy in which freedom of conscience, freedom of effort, freedom of earnings and self-government rule.

Soon will come the day when unabridged liberty again shall be yours. In your resistance I wish you boldness and steadfast perseverance. Strive as you strove during the years of the two World Wars. The time of your resurgence is nearing.

Long live a free and honestly democratic Czechoslovak republic.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you Congressman SABATH. I am sure that your encouraging words will inspire the Czech and Slovak people to increased exertion for freedom from despotic communism.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I repeat that the Voice of America is rendering a real service in its broadcasts. We should continue its functions and even on a larger scale in our efforts for peace and the avoidance of a third world war.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the pending bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand the time is to be equally divided between the majority and the minority?

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the time is to be equally divided.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4740, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is entitled to recognition for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is entitled to recognition for 3 hours.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized.

KEEP POLITICS OUT OF FOREIGN POLICY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for pointing out the apparent schism among Republican leaders over the views of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

In his violent criticism of Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, and as such director of Voice of America activities, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was actually, in effect, telling his side of the aisle that General MacArthur had fed Congress a lot of "baloney"—to use the gentleman's own phrase—when he appeared before the joint session on Thursday, April 19, 1951, and said this to our membership:

> Before one may objectively assess the situation now existing there—
>
> General areas of Asia—
>
> he must comprehend something of Asia's past and the revolutionary changes which have marked her course up to the present. Long exploited by the so-called colonial powers, with little opportunity to achieve any degree of social justice, individual dignity, or a higher standard of life such as guided our own noble administration in the Philippines * * * the peoples of Asia now see the dawn of new opportunity * * *.
>
> What the peoples strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs, a little better clothing on their backs, a little firmer roof over their heads.

With these statements of General MacArthur I wholeheartedly agree, and I am amazed that our colleague from Ohio considers such factors so unimportant.

As I said I am pleased that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has reminded the gentleman from Ohio that the attack he directed against Mr. Barrett was nothing less than an attack on the philosophy of General MacArthur.

The gentleman from Ohio repeatedly made the statement that the Voice of America has been a conceded failure. I do not believe any fair-minded person will agree with him, nor will they agree with him that this Nation does not have a definite foreign policy. It not only has a definte foreign policy but it has a successful foreign policy which has resisted Communist aggression at every turn and has repeatedly stopped its advance. Witness the defeat of Communist aggression in Western Europe because of our strong policy as enunciated in the Truman doctrine. Will the gentleman from Ohio say the Greek-Turkish aid program was a failure? Will he claim that the encouragement which our foreign policy has given to the nations of Western Europe has not thrown back the Communists in Italy, France, and all the other nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Our strong foreign policy has definitely stopped the advance of the Communist aggressor in every part of the world and the gentleman from Ohio knows that. The thing for every Member of this House to do is to strive to keep our foreign policy out of politics and to work together in support of the President to throw a united opposition against aggressors who threathen the peace of the world. There are things more important than party politics.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, before taking up the items in this pending bill H. R. 4740 making appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and for the Federal judiciary, I wish to point out that your committee sat long and laboriously considering the details of the various items contained in this bill. I do not believe that a more harmonious subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations or a more harmonious committee of the House ever were grouped together to consider such important legislation and to do so in such a fair and courteous manner.

I wish to commend my fellow committee members: the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], for their kind assistance to and patience with me as chairman during the many, many days of hearings. I am deeply obligated to each and every one of them for their valuable assistance in ferreting out the details of the many items in this bill which have resulted in proper reductions by your subcommittee.

This is the sixth year in which I have served on this subcommittee with the distinguished and able gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I admire, I adore the gentleman from Nebraska. It is always a pleasure to serve with him. I feel that I would be remiss in common courtesy if I did not call to the attention of the House the splendid cooperation he gave his fellow committee members and the courtesies we have always received from him. They were the same courtesies I received from him as a member of the same committee during the Eightieth Congress when he was the chairman.

I wish to thank the capable gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] who substituted for one of the minority Members for a number of days during the hearings as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] who sat in on the mark-up of the bill. I would be entirely remiss if I did not at this time express the thanks of the committee here on the floor of the House to the executive secretary of our committee, Mr. Jay B. Howe, formerly with the FBI, who has worked long and arduously in helping us to get together this huge and interesting appropriation bill; and to thank his assistant, Mr. Bob Moyer, who assisted at all the daily hearings on the bill during the course of the early months of this year.

I think the committee has written a good bill; I am sure the committee cannot be successfully criticized for not having economized in connection with this appropriation request. Generally, no matter what a Subcommittee on Appropriations does, it is always subject to criticism. A department or agency of the Government may request the Bureau of the Budget for a certain sum of money, let us say a million dollars, and the Bureau of the Budget, without any rhyme or reason or explanation to anyone, can cut that request to the extent of $500,000. When the Committee on Appropriations is asked for that $500,000 it cannot make a further cut in that amount without being able to explain on this floor to anyone who asks the question why the cut was made and the reasons therefor.

This committee was asked to appropriate the sum of $1,258,296,141 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Federal judiciary in fiscal year 1952. Your committee cut that requested amount to the extent of 16.4 percent, to $1,051,715,115, a reduction of $206,581,026. There are contained in the bill a great many items which are utterly necessary for national defense and which could not be cut in good judgment by your committee.

If you refer to the summary on page 2 of the committee report on this bill you will find that the bulk of the cuts are centered in the Departments of State and Commerce. Insofar as the Department of Justice is concerned, we were asked for the amount of $184,356,000. Your committee saw fit to reduce that to $181,667,000, a cut of $2,689,000. It is impossible to sensibly cut the Department of Justice phase of this bill any further when you consider that included herein are such important Government agencies as the Attorney General's Office, including all of the divisions thereof—the Criminal Division, the Tax Division, the Customs Division, all admittedly hard-working offices—which are producing results with which everybody in the country is pretty well satisfied and which produce revenue for the Treasury. When you consider that included in the bill for the Department of Justice is the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal Prison System, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, fees and expenses of witnesses and salaries of United States attorneys and marshals, you find that these appropriation requests cannot be cut any further than your committee unanimously pared them.

With regard to the appropriations requests for the Federal judiciary, requests to the amount of $26,489,740, your committee found unanimously that we could safely delete from the bill the amount of $571,625, leaving an appropriation for the instant fiscal year of $25,918,115 to operate our Federal courts.

With regard to the request for the Department of Commerce, where we were asked to appropriate the amount of $763,763,925, your committee saw fit to cut the sum of $151,065,925, almost 20 percent, so that the net amount appropriated or carried in the bill for that Department is the sum of $612,698,000.

It should be noted with regard to the total amount recommended in this bill for the fiscal year 1952, to wit, the sum of $1,051,715,115, that this amount allowed by the committee is over 13 percent less than the amount $1,212,412,637 appropriated in the last fiscal year for the same agencies.

Insofar as the Department of State is concerned, every single item for that Department has been reduced to some extent, with one exception. I refer to the Philippine rehabilitation program, wherein the committee was called upon to pay out in cash $3,000,000 to liquidate prior contract authority—prior authority which caused a valid legal obligation on the part of the Government to pay for work done under contracts already entered into.

The provision exempting the Department of State from the law prescribing the use of vessels of United States registry by any officer or employee of the United States, has been deleted. Basic law requires that officers and employees of the United States use American ships. We have seen fit—and at the moment I am frank to say that I am not sure that we are absolutely right in doing this but we certainly think it is worthy of a trial in order to help the American merchant marine—to require that as many employees as possible in the Department use American ships. If as time goes on we find that this is going to result in a more costly operation insofar as the American taxpayer is concerned, we can revert to the present practice.

Now with regard to the item in the Department of State title of this bill for what is described as Department of State, salaries and expenses, I call your attention to the fact that this appropriation covers not only the salaries and expenses of the entire Department but of approximately 300 Foreign Service posts throughout the world. The amount recommended represents a reduction of $1,900,000 in the budget estimate, and is $2,992,000 below the amount of $78,492,000 appropriated for this item for the fiscal year just ended. However, the fiscal year 1951 appropriation included certain nonrecurring items totaling $3,823,133, the largest of which was $3,615,000 for USIES, that is the Information and Education Service, the so-called Voice of America, for administrative support to be financed under that appropriation in 1952. The amount included allows for statutory promotions but provides for no staff increase and limits the expenditures for other purposes to that of fiscal year 1951.

The committee has included in the bill language providing that not less than $10,000,000 of the amount allowed for the State Department shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States. So that we require the Department of State, insofar as total appropriations allowed for salaries and expenses, Department of State, are concerned, to use at least $10,000,000 of the $75,500,000 appropriation in foreign credits and foreign currencies.

In regard to representation allowances, the committee was requested for the amount of $1,000,000 and saw fit to reduce that amount by the sum of $150,000. Later on in the debate my esteemed friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] will claim that this is the booze bill for the Department of State, and we will again debate the matter as we have now year after year. Let me point out at this time that representation allowances are to reimburse officers of the Foreign Service for expenses incurred by them at their posts of duty throughout the world for entertainment necessary in the conduct of their official duties and for purchases of flowers, wreaths, and similar tokens for presentation in accordance with local custom on appropriate occasions. This appropriation was intended to remove personal wealth as a prerequisite to appointment to high positions in the Foreign Service. If we are going to attack this appropriation, we are on our way back to the old system under which we will not have career diplomats in the important diplomatic posts throughout the world, under which we will have only those who are in the million-dollar class and who can afford to use their own funds for the purposes mentioned. This was a reform that took place a number of years ago, and was received with acclaim by the Congress and by the people of the United States.

In regard to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund one might think at first glance that the cut made in this item is a very substantial and drastic one. The budget estimate of $4,627,000 to be paid into the Foreign Service retirement and disability trust fund, established to provide annuities for Foreign Service officers, is presently disallowed for the reason that there was an existing balance as of June 30, 1950, of $16,923,100, and the annual cost of the annuities is approximately only $1,200,000. It is felt that under no circumstances will we be called upon during fiscal year 1952 to supply any further funds for this purpose.

The total amount recommended in the bill for the Department of Justice is an increase of $23,445,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951. The major items of increase above the amount appropriated for 1951 are for the FBI, $20,728,000; Immigration and Naturalization Service, $2,160,000; and for general legal activities, $1,127,000. The major part of these increases is necessary to annualize the salaries and expenses for additional personnel authorized on a part-year basis in supplemental appropriations for 1951 made for the purpose of enforcing the Internal Security Act and to assure adequate protection to this country from the threat of communistic and other subversive activities.

As I have already pointed out the budget estimates for the Department of Commerce, exclusive of maritime activities for which appropriations for fiscal year 1952 were contained in the Independent Offices appropriation bill, total $763,763,925. The appropriations for fiscal year 1951, as reduced under section 1214 amounted to $712,652,886 plus contract authority of $40,865,000, for a total of $753,517,886. The bill appropriates $612,698,000, a reduction of $151,065,925 below budget estimates and a decrease of $140,819,886 below the amount of cash and contract authority granted for fiscal year 1951.

The total recommended by the Committee for the Civil Aeronautics Administration is $159,623,000. This is a reduction of $40,060,000 from the amount of the budget estimates.

The committee reiterates once again that it is strongly of the opinion that the Government should be reimbursed by the commercial airlines for many of the services presently rendered without charge by this agency. The Federal Government cannot continue indefinitely building and operating more and more facilities for use by the commercial airlines without receiving any reimbursement therefor.

The sum of $99,100,000, a reduction of $3,700,000 in the amount of the budget estimate, is approved for salaries and expenses. The amount recommended is $600,000 over the sum appropriated for fiscal year 1951. The committee recognizes the important role of this agency in national defense and in promoting and safeguarding safety in air travel. Were it not for these factors a greater reduction would have been recommended. The committee feels that the necessary programs of the administration can be carried on within the funds allowed without impairing in any way safety in aviation. No part of the reduction shall cause any relaxation in maximum safety standards.

Over 75 percent of this appropriation is required for the operation of Federal airways which include such facilities as airport traffic-control towers, aeronautical communication stations, air route traffic-control centers, radio ranges, instrument landing systems, airport surveillance radar, and precision approach and surveillance radar.

The committee was advised that economies as previously recommended by the committee had been effectuated. The amount allowed will require that a continuing evaluation be made of the various facilities operated in the Federal airway system and that those which are outmoded and least effective be eliminated.

The committee recommends $3,550,000 for the Civil Aeronautics Board. This is a reduction of $350,000 in the amount of the budget estimate. The increase of $50,000 allowed over fiscal year 1951 is to provide for such mandatory items as within-grade salary advancements.

It will be recalled that a year ago this committee and the Congress saw fit to decrease the request of this Board from $4,323,000 to $3,500,000, a reduction in funds to the extent of $823,000. At that time the committee and the Congress were severely criticized and were accused of ruining and gutting the CAB. However, on March 19 of this year, the then chairman of the CAB advised the committee as follows:

Mr. ROONEY. How is the Board functioning?

Mr. RENTZEL. That is a matter of opinion, I imagine, but I think it is running pretty good.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it functioning a bit more smoothly than it was?

Mr. RENTZEL. We think so. We have just completed our reorganization over there and the principal objectives, a month ago, to be exact, the principal objective was to streamline the organization of the Board and give it some central direction to establish some policies and to eliminate the duplication, and we are hopeful that we have met the criticisms that have been aimed at the Board by this committee and others and we feel that we are getting a job done. We are getting rid of some of the backlog.

Mr. ROONEY. How is that alleged imposing backlog coming along?

Mr. RENTZEL. We admit some of it was paper backlog. We are trying to get rid of those. A lot of those cases are cases which were filed for defensive reasons.

Mr. ROONEY. You are not trying to flatter the committee, are you, Mr. Rentzel, by pointing out that a lot of the backlog was paper backing? We were the first to suspect that.

Mr. RENTZEL. I am aware of your criticisms and I might say that we took the committee report last year and attempted to meet each one of them that we could.

It is recommended that legislation be enacted to separate air-line subsidies from compensation for the cost of carrying air mail. The subsidy portion, if any, should be paid through a separate appropriation rather than as presently handled through the appropriation for the Post Office Department.

The items in this bill for the Federal judiciary provide for the expenses of operating all of the Federal courts, including the salaries and expenses of judges and other necessary employees, salaries and expenses of bankruptcy referees, the cost of the probation system, and repair and upkeep of Federal court buildings and grounds.

The committee was advised that the disposition of criminal cases in the Federal courts continues to be expeditious. Thirty-six thousand one hundred and nine criminal cases were disposed of in 1950 compared with 36,383 filed, leaving pending 8,181 cases. When allowance is made for cases pending in which the defendants are fugitives or are serving sentences on other charges, it is estimated that the backlog of criminal cases represents approximately 2 months' work for the courts. With reference to civil cases the condition is somewhat different. There were 53,259 cases disposed of in 1950, an increase of nearly 5,000 over 1949. The number of civil cases disposed of was 1,363 less than the number begun during 1950 with the result that the backlog of civil cases was increased to 55,603 at the end of the year.

I take it that when we get to the point of reading this bill for amendment there will be two principal items of disagreement. One will be the item referred to during debate on the rule today by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and concerns the Voice of America.

As I pointed out at that time, I have been a long-time constructive critic of the operations of the Voice of America. I have criticized it for the purpose of making it better and more effective. But I am thoroughly in accord with the thought that we must have a strong and efficient information service. I would be prepared to vote an appropriation of $1,000,000,000 to meet the Soviet expenditure for the same purpose, provided I know we are going to get a dollar's worth for a dollar.

This bill has been substantially reduced insofar as the Voice of America is concerned, from $115,000,000 to $85,000,000. But I do not believe in curing a patient who has a sore throat by cutting his head off, which is the philosophy advanced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I want a better information service and Voice of America. I want it to get better and better.

With regard to all this criticism we have heard today concerning broadcasts of the Voice of America, let me point out that complete scripts of the broadcasts are furnished members of the Committee on Appropriations and other Members of the House regularly by the State Department. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and his investigator, Mr. Lee, are causing my eyesight to become impaired reading scripts. I have an arrangement with the Department whereby if a Member asks them for a script another copy is sent to me, so that I may examine it to find out whether or not there may be some just criticism of it. On some days I find piles of broadcasting scripts this high on my desk.

Now that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has all the scripts he has asked for, I am looking forward to some statements during this debate from the other side alleging those scripts broadcast during the past year which they find fault with. They have the scripts. Let them produce them and let us see what is wrong, if anything, with those scripts.

The other matter or item concerning which we may be in disagreement is the matter of unconstitutionally inserting in this bill a rider or amendment which would deny his lawful salary to the present Secretary of State. Back on the 14th of May last I noted an article in the Washington Star captioned "GOP weighs plans for forcing Acheson out of Cabinet post." It alleged that—

Representative PHILLIPS, Republican, of California, today came up with a new strategy for House Republicans seeking to force Dean Acheson out of office as Secretary of State.

Such a campaign has been under discussion in House cloak rooms for several weeks.

Mr. PHILLIPS, a member of the Appropriations Committee, has drafted an amendment which would strike Mr. Acheson from the State Department payroll without mentioning him by name. Attempts to eliminate individuals by name have been blocked in the past by court rulings.

Let me here interpose the fact that whether or not you mention an individual by name, the gentleman from California's amendment would be a bill of attainder, prohibited by article I, section 9, of the Constitution of the United States. It was so held in the case of *United States* v. *Lovett* (328 U. S. 303) some 4 or 5 years ago by the United States Supreme Court.

In the Lovett case the question for decision was the validity of a strikingly similar statutory provision: section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 provided that—

No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used * * * to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services," of three named Federal officials.

The three named employees were continued in their jobs, but, when their pay was withheld after the effective date of the provision, the three brought suit for their pay in the Court of Claims. The Court of Claims found for plaintiffs on the theory that the statutory provision was merely intended to preclude the payment of salaries out of general appropriations, and was not intended to prevent the United States from paying its contractual obligations for services rendered by the three plaintiffs at the instance of the United States (104 Ct. Cl. 557; 66 Fed. Sup. 142).

On certiorari, the Supreme Court recognized, on the basis of legislative history, that it was the clear intent of Congress to terminate all Federal compensation for the three Federal officials. Accordingly, the Supreme Court found itself squarely confronted with three grave constitutional questions:

First, whether the statute violated article I, section 9 of the Constitution, which provides that "No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed";

Second, whether the statute was an unconstitutional infringement of the executive prerogative to remove officials of the executive arm of the Government;

Third, whether the statute violated the due-process clause of the fifth amendment.

The Supreme Court held section 304 to be a bill of attainder within the meaning of article I, section 9, of the Constitution. Accordingly, as the Court stated:

Much as we regret to declare that an act of Congress violates the Constitution, we have no alternative here (328 U. S. at 318).

In brief, the Court held in the Lovett case that to deprive a specifically designated person of his Federal office "is punishment, and of a most severe type" (328 U. S. 316). And punishment, as the Court made clear, must, under the American constitutional system, be imposed by the courts and not by legislatures.

The precedents on which the Court relied amply demonstrate the traditional Anglo-American abhorrence for bills of attainder. Thus, in the historic case of *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (71 U. S. 277 (1866)), the Supreme Court invalidated—as bills of attainder and ex post facto laws—provisions of the post-Civil War Missouri constitution which forbade priests and clergymen from practicing their callings unless they took a test oath swearing that they had not in the past been associated in any way with enemies of the United States. And in the companion case of *Ex parte Garland* (71 U. S. 333), the Supreme Court struck down a Federal statute closing the courts of the United States to all lawyers who failed to take a similar test oath.

In framing his proposed amendment, the gentleman from California has attempted to conceal the clear object of

the legislation by not naming Secretary Acheson directly. But the device attempted is wholly ineffective from a constitutional standpoint. It is true that in the Lovett case the challenged statute explicitly named the three men who were the targets of the legislation. But the Court's opinion in the Lovett case makes clear that the presence or absence of the names was immaterial to the decision:

> Legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply either to named individuals or to clearly ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial are bills of attainder prohibited by the Constitution (328 U. S. at 315-316).

And it is to be noted that Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who did not agree that the statute was a bill of attainder but who concurred on the theory adopted by the Court of Claims, also expressly noted that under the Cummings and Garland decisions the presence of the name of the legislative target is immaterial:

> That the persons legislatively punished were not named was a mere detail of identification (328 U. S. 327).

Recognition that the wording of the enactment cannot be permitted to obscure its constitutional invalidity is underscored by the gentleman's remarks about his original proposal, reported in the Washington Star for May 14, 1951:

> To name the individual could be construed as a bill of attainder and therefore illegal. By not naming Acheson, but by approving a limitation such as I have proposed, we would accomplish the same result.

The complete answer to this attempt to circumvent the Constitution is provided by the language of the Supreme Court in the Cummings case:

> If the clauses of the second article of the Constitution of Missouri, to which we have referred, had in terms declared that Mr. Cummings was guilty, or should be held guilty, of having been in armed hostility to the United States, or of having entered that State to avoid being enrolled or drafted into the military service of the United States, and, therefore, should be deprived of the right to preach as a priest of the Catholic Church, or to teach in any institution of learning, there could be no question that the clauses would constitute a bill of attainder within the meaning of the Federal Constitution. If these clauses, instead of mentioning his name, had declared that all priests and clergymen within the State of Missouri were guilty of these acts, or should be held guilty of them, and hence be subjected to the like deprivation, the clauses would be equally open to objection. And, further, if these clauses had declared that all such priests and clergymen should be so held guilty, and be thus deprived, provided they did not, by a day designated, do certain specified acts, they would be no less within the inhibition of the Federal Constitution.
>
> In all these cases there would be the legislative enactment creating the deprivation without any of the ordinary forms and guards provided for the security of the citizen in the administration of justice by the established tribunals.
>
> The results which would follow from clauses of the character mentioned do follow from the clauses actually adopted. The difference between the last case supposed and the case actually presented is one of form only, and not of substance. The existing clauses presume the guilt of the priests and clergymen, and adjudge the deprivation of their right to preach or teach unless the presumption be first removed by their expurgatory oath—in other words, they assume the guilt and adjudge the punishment conditionally. The clauses supposed differ only in that they declare the guilt instead of assuming it. The deprivation is effected with equal certainty in the one case as it would be in the other, but not with equal directness. The purpose of the lawmaker in the case supposed would be openly avowed; in the case existing it is only disguised. The legal result must be the same, for what cannot be done directly cannot be done indirectly. The Constitution deals with substance, not shadows. Its inhibition was leveled at the thing, not the name. It intended that the rights of the citizen should be secure against deprivation for past conduct by legislative enactment, under any form, however disguised. If the inhibition can be evaded by the form of the enactment, its insertion in the fundamental law was a vain and futile proceeding (71 U. S. at 324-325).

It is clear that, under the ruling in the Lovett case, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California—in its original or its revised form—would be a bill of attainder. In its original form, as quoted above, it clearly imposes punishment on "easily ascertainable members of a group." Because the "group" turned out to be larger than the gentleman supposed, he is now narrowing his aim and pin-pointing the invalidity of his amendment by defining the "group" to include only Secretary Acheson.

The proposed amendment poses grave constitutional questions quite aside from its characteristics as a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law.

The additional questions raised but not decided in the Lovett case are equally pertinent here—whether such a provision violates due process and whether it encroaches on the executive power.

These two issues, as Mr. Justice Frankfurter recognized in his concurrence in the Lovett case, are "serious constitutional questions" (328 U. S. 327-328) questions which go to the heart of our constitutional system.

The due-process issue raises grave questions as to the reasonableness of imposing limitations on State Department officers, or on the Secretary of State alone, which are not applicable to any other officer of the Federal Government.

The question of encroachment on the Executive power presents the converse of the issues raised in *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602 (1935)), in which the Supreme Court, limiting the rule of *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52 (1926)), held that the President was powerless to discharge a member of the Federal Trade Commission except for cause defined in advance by Congress. For, as the Court there pointed out:

> The fundamental necessity of maintaining each of the three general departments of Government entirely free from the control or coercive influence, direct or indirect, of either of the others, has often been stressed and is hardly open to serious question. So much is implied in the very fact of the separation of the powers of these departments by the Constitution; and in the rule which recognizes their essential co-equality. The sound application of a principle that makes one master in his own house precludes him from imposing his control in the house of another who is master there (295 U. S. 629-630).

In this connection, I believe most Members of the House have seen the newspaper cartoon I have here. It is from the front page of the Washington Star of July 11. It shows an ample gentleman in the process of firing a hefty blunderbuss into the woods. The ample gentleman is labeled "House Republicans," and the blunderbuss is called the "Phillips amendment."

As the blunderbuss goes off with a stupendous blast, a number of little elephants come scurrying out of the woods. The elephants, understandably, have an expression of stark fear on their chubby faces—as would any animal running for its life, political or otherwise. These elephants are labeled "GOP jobholders."

Now, this cartoon would appear to be all wrong—for no gentleman labeled "House Republicans" is going to wander around firing a blunderbuss at Republican office holders. But what straightens everything out is what the blunderbuss-firing gentleman is saying. He is saying, "I was firing at Dean Acheson."

Well, it did not take long for the blunderbuss-toting gentleman to find out that you just do not go hunting for an Acheson that way. It is dangerous. Very dangerous. You might—just might—hit what you are aiming at, but in the process you are going to kill off a lot of your kith and kin.

Well, as I said, it did not take long for the blunderbuss shooter to discover this—after a lot of expert hunters pointed it out to him.

But our blunderbuss shooter is on a hunting spree now, and nothing is going to put him off. So what does he do? He puts up his blunderbuss and gets himself a sharpshooter's rifle. Now he will go hunting for an Acheson—for an Acheson and nothing else.

But whether with blunderbuss or rifle the ample gentleman is no fair hunter. First of all, a hunter obeys the laws. The supreme law of the land specifically says you cannot hunt and shoot an Acheson—or any other similar game—with such a sharpshooting rifle as the hunter has now taken into his hands. He has no license for such hunting.

He would ask us, in effect, to break the law and give him a special license to go out and shoot an Acheson.

Now, hunting, whether in the field or in politics, has its points. But it also has its rules. Our blunderbuss shooter now turned sharpshooter knows these rules only too well. He knows the law provides excellent rules for the tapping and shooting of every sort of political game. Let him obey the law.

You can imagine what would happen if we gave our hunter a license. Why, the woods would be so full of inept game-shooters that before long they would be a menace not only to everything in the field but to themselves as well.

No, this House cannot issue such an illegal license—either for blunderbuss shooters or sharpshooters. Acheson-

hunting may be a vote-getting sport for our ample hunting gentleman, but he will have to do his hunting under the legal rules and with the legal weapons of the land.

Better still, it would be healthier for all of us if our eager huntsman would take up fishing in quiet waters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes, and I now yield to the gentleman from California, whose name I mentioned.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for not yielding to me before, because I would have missed those very interesting remarks.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The quotation you read from the paper was not mine. I just wanted to tell you that.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman would point out in what respect it was not his, and what his ideas on this subject are.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Briefly, because it will come up at the proper time. The quotation which said, "Get Acheson," was never mine.

Mr. ROONEY. You would not attempt to do such a thing?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not directly, no.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman for his frankness.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Only on the basis of principle, which I think is involved, and which will come up in an amendment

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman care to explain to us what sort of an amendment he proposes?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. At the proper time, I shall be glad to. Never at any time were the long list of names, 37 in all, ever affected.

Mr. ROONEY. We shall see whether or not that is so when we get to the proper time. The amendment that was proposed by the gentleman, according to the newspapers, would not only get Dean Acheson. It would get John Foster Dulles. It would get our distinguished ambassador in Madrid. It would probably get our ambassador in London, Walter S. Gifford. It would get Thomas D. Cabot, Geoffrey Parsons, Richard Patterson and many others, many of whom are of the same Republican faith as the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not know why the gentleman is carrying on such a one-sided argument. They were never in the list. That was a fishing expedition on the part of the State Department, and characteristic of the State Department, I might say.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman, before I yield the floor to whomever it was that asked me to yield next, that we will get to that at the proper time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. What I have to discuss is one of the minor provisions of the bill, that affects people in my area. On page 10 of the report there is a paragraph on salaries and expenses for claims of persons of Japanese ancestry. The item that is awarded for that purpose for payment of claims is $500,000. Why have the administrative expenses for processing those claims been so high in proportion to the amount paid?

Mr. ROONEY. That has been one of the complaints of the committee. The committee, if the gentleman will read the printed hearings on this subject, has been highly critical for some time of the delay in processing these claims of persons of Japanese ancestry; and may I say to the gentleman from California that every member of this committee—I believe that is a fair statement, if it is not the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] may correct me—is in sympathy with the thought of the gentleman from California that we should promptly and expeditiously dispose of these claims, most of which I would say are fair and equitable and arise from hurried displacement of these folks from their homes in California and on the west coast.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have read the testimony in full. It covers about three pages. I notice that the gentleman from New York was the one who did the questioning and brought out the various points involved in the problem. But one question I want to ask the gentleman is this: Do you think that the basic law that lays down the right of these people to make claims is too ambiguous or too broad? The reason I ask that question is that Mr. Clapp, I think that was the name of the gentleman, complained that it was very hard to determine just what the criteria were which a claimant must present. He also mentioned the fact that many of the claimants cannot talk the English language. I think it is up to the claimants to furnish the interpreter, either relatives or interpreters, to make their claim.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON. They should not saddle that cost onto the Government. What does the gentleman think about the law itself, the basic act? Should it be amended?

Mr. ROONEY. As of the time of these hearings, if my memory serves me right, there was a discussion regarding prompt disposition of all claims up to $2,500; in other words, permission to the Department of Justice to go out and expeditiously pay off a claimant up to that amount. Such a bill was passed by the House last June 4 and is H. R. 3142, now pending in the other body. It would permit prompt claims adjustment and save a great deal of administrative detail and a great deal of time, would be fair to the claimant, and at the same time fair to the taxpayers.

Mr. JOHNSON. But the Attorney General is reluctant to make decisions because he does not seem to have a clear-cut conception of the purpose of the law, and does not seem to know just what it is that a claimant must present to support his claim.

Mr. ROONEY. I must say to the gentleman from California that that is a matter that must be handled by the legislative committee. As the gentleman from California knows, I always believed in the proposition that the Committee on Appropriations should never legislate and should not take over the prerogatives of the legislative committees.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am thinking of drafting an amendment to clarify the procedure a claimant must follow to present a claim, and I wanted to get the gentleman's views on the problem.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know that my testimony of the moment would have any weight with the legislative committee; as a matter of fact, I do not know that I have the authority of this subcommittee to go into that subject. We are concerned primarily with the payment of adjudicated claims; we must furnish money according to the basic law, to pay these claims.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. We must furnish the money to pay the claims but we are not in a position to adjudicate them.

Mr. JOHNSON. But the law should be plain so that the Administrator could know just what kind of claims he should pay.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I notice that the committee gave only $500,000 for the payment of these claims, yet the estimated amount of these claims, stated by the chief witness, aggregated $131,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman from California that we allowed every penny of the amount requested by the chief witness for the payment of these claims. The amount requested was $500,000, and we provided every dime of it.

Mr. JOHNSON. At that rate it would take over 200 years to pay these claims, and most of the people making these claims are aged people now.

Mr. ROONEY. There may be some question of the validity of the information which the gentleman has with regard to the amount involved and the number of claims.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is in the record there; I read it. The gentleman tried to get the essential information, I know.

Mr. ROONEY. We allowed every penny presently requested for payment of the claims.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. On pages 4 and 5 of the report I notice that contributions to international organizations are set at $29,300,000; and on page 5 you indicate a certain reduction by percentages.

Mr. ROONEY. No; we do not. We do not attempt to itemize the reductions in our report, I must say to the gentleman; we merely point out at page 5 certain reductions made by the Department of State and the international organizations.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Do I understand the State Department takes this amount, then allocates it to the various organizations? The point I

would like to make is this: How much did we contribute to UN last year, or what will our contribution be to UN and UNESCO and to world health organizations?

Mr. ROONEY. Last year our share of the United Nations was $13,576,243, our share of UNESCO was $2,814,381, and our share of WHO was $3,070,931. For 1952 the contemplated American share of UN is $16,394,244, our share of UNESCO, $2,785,400, and of WHO, $2,481,159.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the statement at page 5 of the committee report with regard to reductions in the United States share to UNESCO has been changed since the printing of our report. On the 11th of July, I am informed, UNESCO further reduced the American share to 33⅓ percent.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I will be glad to have the figures in the RECORD and I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. On this matter of Federal aid to the airport program, has the gentleman's committee done anything about reviewing the expenditures for aid to the various projects?

Mr. ROONEY. We have investigated and found some irregularities, which I believe are pointed out in this report, in regard to three airports down in Louisiana; but as far as examination concerning every airport in America is concerned, I must say to the gentleman we have not done that.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Did the question of the Burke Airport come up?

Mr. ROONEY. Not at all. There is no question about the Burke Airport in this bill. We do not select airports for the Federal aid to airport program.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is there any money in this appropriation that will carry out the Burke Airport.

Mr. ROONEY. There is no money in this, with which the committee is concerned, for Burke Airport. This committee does not select airport sites. CAA does.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I appreciate that.

Mr. ROONEY. We studiously avoid that, as a matter of common sense. As the gentleman can appreciate, if we came in here with recommendations, those who were left out would not be in too good humor about going along with the others. We leave that in the hands of the Executive. They set up the airport program for fiscal year 1952, which we will be glad to show the gentleman. All of the proposed airports are set out in it.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Regardless of whether there might be any duplication of existing facilities or not?

Mr. ROONEY. That is a matter for the Congress generally.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. During the course of the gentleman's discussion, I wish he would go into rather detailed discussion about the housing situation that we have read so much about over in Germany, Frankfurt, and other places.

Mr. STEFAN. I will be glad to do that. I think the best place to do that would be under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I just want to remind the gentleman that it should be thoroughly discussed.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, in presenting the bill making annual appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and the Federal Judiciary, we of the minority wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable JOHN ROONEY, of New York, and the other members of the majority membership of the subcommittee—the Honorable DAN FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; the Honorable PRINCE PRESTON, of Georgia; and the Honorable FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota—for their courtesy, fine cooperation, and nonpartisan spirit during all of our deliberations. I also wish to commend the very able and efficient executive secretary of the subcommittee, Mr. Jay Howe, for his excellent services.

This bill comes to you with some reservations on the part of the minority and, for the first time in some years, it reaches you without a unanimous report. We are pleased that substantial reductions have been made in some of the items. With that action we agree. We are in disagreement on some other items which will be the basis for amendments we are prepared to offer when the bill is read for amendment.

There has been so much said and so much printed about one of the departments affected by the bill—the Department of State—that I am impelled to discuss that agency in some detail. I have prepared charts which should give the membership a better picture of the problem as related to appropriations and the results obtained over a period of years. While the hearings on this bill are complete and should be read by every Member who is interested in the condition of our ship of state, these hearings are voluminous and contain statistics and figures that are sometimes confusing. Therefore, I felt the charts I now present will simplify the picture and perhaps answer some of the questions that are in your minds.

First of all, I should inform the House that the Congress over a period of 10 or 11 years has or will have appropriated for the Department of State $2,000,000,000. In 1942 appropriations for this Department totaled about $37,500,000. In 1938 the Department had 5,000 positions and the appropriations totaled $19,600,000. The request of this same Department for 1952 was $283,500,000 and the subcommittee has allowed $236,400,000. The request was for 28,738 permanent positions. The Congress has not been niggardly with appropriations and enabling legislation for this Department.

The first chart I wish to show to the House at this time is numbered chart 4, furnished to me by the Department of State. It indicates that 28,738 is the total number of persons for which the Department requested. As you will note in the first line on this chart under the heading "Number of permanent positions," the request was for 14,191, or 49.4 percent for the Department proper. In comparison, the request for the Voice of America, or what is known as International Information and Education Activities, was for 13,518, or 47 percent of all the permanent positions of the entire Department of State. The Congress has been generous with the Voice of America. The other figures on this chart show the numbers of personnel in other divisions of the Department which add up to the total requested number of permanent positions of 28,738.

APPROPRIATIONS

Chart No. 2, which I present to you at this time, shows all of the Department of State 1952 appropriation estimates beginning with salaries and expenses of the Department of State proper of $77,400,000, or 27.3 percent of the total requested, which amounts to $283,566,476. Representation allowance request is a million dollars; Foreign Service retirement is $4,627,000; acquisition of buildings abroad is $9,000,000; emergencies in diplomatic and consular service was $19,900,000, which has been reduced to $9,900,000; contributions to international organizations is $30,684,476, or over 10 percent of the total and which item is growing because of authorizations made by the Congress. The next item, missions to international organizations, is $1,570,000, is showing some increase due to legislation passed by the Congress. The International Boundary and Water Commission of $17,450,000, or a little over 6 percent of the total, is largely confined to the activities on the Mexican border. The next item of salaries and expenses of American sections to international commissions of $870,000 is almost uncontrollable in view of the continued legislation passed by the Congress. However, I call your attention to the International Information and Education Activities, or the Voice of America's request of $115,000,000, which is 40.6 percent of the total request for the entire State Department as compared with the 27.3 percent for the Department of State proper. It should be made clear at this time that for fiscal year 1951 International Information and Education Activities, or the Voice of America, has had appropriations of $121,000,000, including supplements and, I understand, a request for another $90,000,000 is being made in another body for the same agency. So you can readily see that the appropriations for this agency have been exceedingly large.

To emphasize the rapid growth in appropriations for the Department of

State, I present a table by years showing that the appropriations for the Department jumped from $37,433,519 in 1942 to $273,947,086 in 1951 which, with a request for $283,566,476 in 1952, is nearly $2,000,000,000 over a period of 11 years. The table of these appropriations follows:

Appropriations by year for Department of State

1942	$37,433,519
1943	68,044,558
1944	65,068,008
1945	58,981,438
1946	101,514,296
1947	187,097,922
1948	311,686,535
1949	285,620,148
1950	279,345,656
1951	273,947,086
1952 (request)	283,566,476
Total	1,952,305,642

On a functional or appropriation basis these amounts for this same period are as follows:

Salaries and expenses	$629,139,565
Representation allowance	6,095,000
Foreign Service retirement	16,051,400
Building fund	114,439,000
Emergencies in service	118,125,000
Contributions to international organizations	396,849,396
Missions to international organizations	10,528,115
International contingencies	25,250,000
International Boundary and Water Commission	8,240,228
Construction, international	36,691,[illegible]60
Rio Grande flood protection	320,100
American Sections, International Commission	4,101,274
International Claims Commission	505,000
International information, etc.	361,434,606
Philippine rehabilitation	142,083,398
Institute of Inter-American Affairs	82,351,600
Total	1,952,305,642

I must remind the House that these figures do not include all the foreign-aid appropriations, which total close to $100,000,000,000. This will be supplemented by a bill not yet written and which, we are informed, will total $8,500,000,000, and will come to this House in the near future.

We are told that our objective is to fight Communist aggression, no matter where it breaks out in the world. Whether or not our appropriations have been effective in this respect I leave to your judgment, after I explain charts that indicate the rapid advance of communism in the world.

SPREAD OF COMMUNISM

Chart 1, World Communism on the March, shows that in 1950 the Communists' slice of the world pie is one-fifth of the total land area of the world. Within this great land area one-third of the world's total population is beneath the yoke of communism. This chart points up Stalin's statement, made in Foundation of Leninism, that—

> The revolution is spreading beyond the confines of one country. The epoch of world revolution has commenced.

Chart 2, Communist World Strength, shows that there are 25,000,000 Communist Party members in the total world population. As depicted by the human symbols, there is 1 party member to every 90 nonmembers. I wish to point out that the Communist Party members are all stanch, ardent, well-indoctrinated adults—the hard core of the party—whereas the balance of the world population considered for statistical purposes includes infants, children, the aged, and infirm; persons of all beliefs and creeds, and so forth. The Communists' true strength is actually far greater than the ratio of 1 to 90. It has been estimated that Communist Party fellow travelers, while not party members, do support the party's aims and programs and actually increase party strength tenfold, or to a total of 250,000,000 persons in sympathy with Communist Party aims. The role of the American Communist is explained in the statement by Stalin included in the chart. He said:

> A word or two regarding the tasks and the mission of the American Communist Party. I think, comrades, that the American Communist Party is one of those few Communist Parties in the world upon which history has laid tasks of a decisive character from the point of view of the world revolutionary movement.

Chart 3, Percent of World Population Under Communist Control, shows that in 1939, depicted by the small slice of the world pie, the Communists controled 7.9 percent, or 170,467,186 of the world population, as compared to 1950, where the slice has grown to 34.4 percent, or 779,458,938 of the world population. While in 1939 their control was exercised in the U. S. S. R., by 1950 their iron curtain has swept over 14 countries. It should be noted that the satellite nations have been brought under the control of the U. S. S. R. since World War II, or August 1945. A statement by William Z. Foster implies by what methods communism has grown. He said:

> The French and Italian Communist Parties have clearly stated their determination not to fight against the U. S. S. R. Our American party has done likewise.

Chart 4, The Growth of World Communism, shows the growth of the Communist Party in a 33-year span, which from 80,000 Bolsheviks located within Russia in 1917 became the international colossus of today embracing 25,000,000 members throughout the world. The human symbol for today is 312.5 times greater than the small silhouette of 1917. The chart further sets forth a statement by Lenin regarding the necessity of revolution and Stalin's statement that the revolution of America is nearly at hand. Lenin said:

> The substitution of the proletarian state for the bourgeois state is impossible without a violent revolution.

Stalin said:

> I think the moment is not far off when a revolutionary crisis will develop in America. And when a revolutionary crisis develops in America that will be the beginning of the end of world capitalism, as a whole.

Again it should be remembered that the true strength of the Communist Party is 10 times the amount of the actual membership.

We of the free world are taking a terrific beating. Money alone will not solve this grave problem. It is a problem which was never faced or even imagined by our founding fathers. This problem demands men of the quality of those who laid the original foundation of our Republic.

HISTORY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. Chairman, General MacArthur has stated that the Yalu River, boundary between Korea and Manchuria, is the first line of defense of these United States.

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt stated that the Rhine River of Germany was the first line of defense of these United States.

I say to you that the first line of defense for these United States once was—and it is still possible for it to be—a strong, patriotic, well-manned, well-trained, well-led, and purposeful American Department of State. Our State Department can have all of these attributes. It must have them, if this Nation is to survive.

Our State Department can be strong because it has been strong.

God gave this Nation experienced statesmen to guide us through our national infancy.

Benjamin Franklin, our first professional Foreign Service officer, had had some 15 years of service as the representative of the political and economic interests of the Thirteen Colonies before the outbreak of the Revolutionary War.

Franklin was associated with the Committee on Secret Correspondence of the Continental Congress as its chairman. As such, he and his associates forged a chain of European powers friendly to the Colonies about embattled England.

After the Declaration of Independence on the 4th of July 1776 a Committee for Foreign Affairs was established. This committee worked with the Committee on Secret Correspondence by keeping American agents abroad informed on domestic developments at home.

Thus, at the beginning of our national life, our foreign affairs were not only a concern of Congress, they were a part of Congress.

It was not until 1781 that a Department of Foreign Affairs was created—and that Department was expressly created to act as an executive arm of Congress.

The first Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Robert R. Livingston, received an annual salary of $4,000. His staff consisted of a First Under Secretary at $800 a year; a Second Under Secretary at $700 a year; a clerk-translator at $500 a year; and a clerk at $500 a year. These expenditures, together with rental of business offices and purchase of pens, ink and paper, constituted the entire expenses of Mr. Livingston's Department, since American representatives abroad paid their own way from fees for visa stamping and like services.

John Jay succeeded Robert Livingston as Secretary of Foreign Affairs. He held that office until 1790—after the ratification of the Constitution—at which time he turned the portfolio over to Thomas Jefferson. Our relations with other nations were maintained, by act of Congress in July 1789, by a Department of

Foreign Affairs. It was not until September of 1789 that the name of this branch of the executive was changed to the Department of State.

This Department of State was a rallying point for statesmen. The finest minds, the most patriotic hearts, in the new Republic were attracted to the Department.

Eight Americans—later to be President of the United States—were diplomatic representatives of the American people abroad.

John Adams, the second President, represented us in France in 1778 and in the Netherlands and Great Britain between 1780 and 1788.

Thomas Jefferson, the third President, represented us in France between 1784 and 1789, serving for four of those years as United States Minister.

James Monroe, the fifth President, represented us in France from 1794 to 1796 and in Great Britain from 1803 to 1807.

John Quincy Adams, the sixth President, represented us in the Netherlands from 1794 to 1797, in Prussia from 1797 to 1801, in Russia from 1809 to 1814, and in Great Britain from 1815 to 1817.

Martin Van Buren, the eighth President, represented us in Great Britain in 1831 and 1832.

William Henry Harrison, the ninth President, represented us in Colombia in 1828 and 1829.

James Buchanan, the fifteenth President, represented us in Russia in 1832 and 1833 and in Great Britain in 1853 to 1856.

Nor are these the only names of great patriots, great thinkers, great Americans who, so very early, made our State Department so very strong. On the roster of early Secretaries of State are these proud names: Edmund Randolph, Timothy Pickering, John Marshall, James Madison, Henry Clay, Edward Livingston, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Edward Everett, and Lewis Cass.

Our consular service rivaled the heads of missions in the first half of the nineteenth century for the courage, the brilliance, the devotion to the interests of the United States for which Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe are so justly renowned.

The consular arm of our diplomatic public servants began in 1780 when Col. William Palfrey, of Masachusetts, was chosen by the Continental Congress to be consul to France.

From the very outset, our consular service was a challenge for the best Americans to exert their finest efforts.

William Eaton, consul at Tunis from 1797 to 1803, is enshrined in American history and romance. His adventures have recently been filmed as a motion picture. It was Eaton who led an army of some 600 Arabs, Greeks, Italians, and others 500 miles across the desert to capture Derna from the Barbary pirates.

Our early consuls knew the America they served.

Washington Irving, consul to Spain from 1826 to 1829, knew his beloved America so well that he wrote Rip Van Winkle.

Poinsett, botanist and military expert, was our first Ambassador to Mexico. In that country, he developed the flower which today bears his name and which has a high place among gifts exchanged at Christmas. He knew his America so well that he gave us a flower to admire.

John Howard Payne, consul at Tunis from 1842 to 1845, loved his America so well that he composed the immortal Home, Sweet Home.

Nathaniel Hawthorne, who captured the living spirit of New England, was consul at Liverpool from 1853 to 1857.

William Dean Howells, editor and novelist, was consul at Venice from 1861 to 1865.

Historian George Bancroft, often called father of the United States Naval Academy, served as United States Minister in London and Berlin.

John Lothrop Motley, another great historian—author of The Rise of the Dutch Republic and The United Netherlands, served in Russia, Austria, and England.

James Russell Lowell, outstanding among the literary men of America and the world, was Minister to Spain from 1877 to 1880 and Minister to Great Britian from 1880 to 1885.

Nor is this an end to the renowned and respected names that raised our State Department to a position of monumental power among the people and the rulers of every nation of their time.

But the State Department, for whom these men labored, did not grow by leaps and bounds although it had been made a catch-all for many domestic functions as well as for the original foreign affairs function for which it had been created.

The Department kept the records of the Government. It issued patents and copyrights. It prepared the census publications. It received applications for pardons. It handled territorial affairs. It issued commercial reports.

Yet, in the 30 years between 1790 and 1820 it grew only from the Secretary and five clerks in 1790 to the Secretary and eleven clerks and three messengers in 1820. The consuls, ministers, and special representatives abroad supported themselves from the various fees of office.

The increase in the size of the State Department was not a nineteenth-century phenomena.

By 1870, the year of the Franco-Prussian War, the Department had increased its staff only to the number of 31 officers.

Intelligent, sincere, dedicated, patriotic men did not need numbers to accomplish results.

Congress was satisfied. From the first congressional definition of the duties of American consuls in 1792 there was no significant congressional movement for change in the Foreign Service until 1855. The act of 1856 remained the organic act for the Foreign Service for more than half a century. That act established the salaries of ministers at $10,000, $12,000, and $17,500 per year, a scale which remained unchanged until 1946. It also authorized the appointment of salaried secretaries of legation; and it placed some consuls—although still not all of them—on a salary basis.

In 1906 Congress completely reorganized the consular service. This reorganization was followed by a series of several Executive orders to put the will of Congress into effect.

The act of 1915 expressed the desire of Congress to put the entire Foreign Service, below the rank of minister, on a merit basis. It authorized the assignment of any diplomatic secretary or consul to temporary service in the Department of State without loss of grade, class, or salary.

The Rogers Act of 1924 was designed to create a modern Foreign Service. It provided for merit alone as the basis for appointment and promotion. It fixed a new salary scale. It combined the diplomatic and consular services into a unified Foreign Service.

The Linthicum-Moses Act of 1931 was an effort by Congress to improve on and correct some defects in the Rogers Act. In effect, however, there were no major changes in the over-all operation of the Foreign Service between the time of the Rogers Act and the act of 1946, under which the Department functions, for the most part, today.

While there have been few legislative changes in the State Department during the twentieth century there have been many administrative changes. When Secretary Fish reorganized the Department in 1870, there were 16 separate units of an administrative nature in the Department. In 1913—43 years after that particular reorganization—there were still only 23 separate administrative units in the Department: an increase of only 7 in 43 years.

James L. McCamy, professor of political science, University of Wisconsin, presents the rate of increase of administrative units in the State Department graphically in a table on page 49 of his book, the Administration of American Foreign Affairs—Knopf, 1950:

Separate and distinct units or organization in specific year, Department of State

Year:	Separate units
1870	16
1913	23
1918	26
1922	30
1931	36
1943	62
1944	94
1948	113

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I should like to insert a chronological list of the Secretaries of State, an overwhelming majority of whom patriotically contributed toward making the Department of State the first line of defense of a strong United States of America:

Secretaries of State

President	Secretary	Date of appointment
Washington	1. Thomas Jefferson	1789
	2. Edmund Randolph	1794
	3. Timothy Pickering	1795
	4. Timothy Pickering	1797 [1]
Adams	5. John Marshall	1800
Jefferson	6. James Madison	1801

[1] Reappointed.

Secretaries of State—Continued

President	Secretary	Date of appointment
Madison	7. Robert Smith	1809
	8. James Monroe	1811
Monroe	9. John Q. Adams	1817
J. Q. Adams	10. Henry Clay	1825
Jackson	11. Martin Van Buren	1829
	12. Edward Livingston	1831
	13. Louis McLane	1833
	14. John Forsyth	1834
Van Buren	15. John Forsyth	1837 [1]
W. H. Harrison	16. Daniel Webster	1841
Tyler	17. Daniel Webster	1841 [1]
	18. Hugh S. Legare	1843
	19. Abel P. Upshur	1843
	20. John C. Calhoun	1844
Polk	21. James Buchanan	1845
Taylor	22. John M. Clayton	1849
Fillmore	23. Daniel Webster	1850
	24. Edward Everett	1852
Pierce	25. William I. Marcy	1853
Buchanan	26. Lewis Cass	1857
	27. Jeremiah Black	1860
Lincoln	28. William H. Seward	1861
Johnson	29. William H. Seward	1865 [1]
Grant	30. Elihu B. Washburne	1869
	31. Hamilton Fish	1869
Hayes	32. William M. Evarts	1877
Garfield	33. James G. Blaine	1881
Arthur	34. F. T. Frelinghuysen	1881
Cleveland	35. Arthur F. Bayard	1885
B. Harrison	36. James G. Blaine	1889
	37. John W. Foster	1892
Cleveland	38. Walter Q. Gresham	1893
	39. Richard Olney	1895
McKinley	40. John Sherman	1897
	41. William R. Day	1898
	42. John Hay	1898
T. Roosevelt	43. John Hay	1901 [1]
	44. Elihu Root	1905
	45. Robert Bacon	1909
Taft	46. Philander C. Knox	1909
Wilson	47. W. J. Bryan	1913
	48. Robert Lansing	1915
	49. Bainbridge Colby	1920
Harding	50. Charles E. Hughes	1921
Coolidge	51. Charles E. Hughes	1923 [1]
	52. Frank B. Kellogg	1925
Hoover	53. Henry L. Stimson	1929
F. D. Roosevelt	54. Cordell Hull	1933
	55. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.	1944
Truman	56. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.	1945
	56. James F. Byrnes	1947
	57. George C. Marshall	1947
	58. Dean G. Acheson	1949

[1] Reappointed.

FOREIGN SERVICE EXPANSION

There has been a great expansion in our Department of State and our Foreign Service over a period of many years. Today the United States has nearly 300 missions located all over the world. Throughout the Service approximately 85 percent of the employees can be considered career personnel. In the higher brackets 60 percent of the personnel are career people. Committees dealing with our foreign affairs, both from the financial and legislative sides, continue encouraging the advancement of the career program in order to make the Service the best in the world. There are still 21 noncareer ambassadors as compared with 35 career ambassadors in the Service. Among the 14 legations, there are 2 political appointees, 9 career appointees. We have 60 career ministers employed, 34 of whom are serving as chief of missions and 26 are specially assigned. When our Foreign Service complement is complete, the total will include 58 ambassadors, 14 legations, 52 consul generals, 127 consulates, 30 consular officers, 7 political advisory offices, and 7 special assigned offices. As world conditions change, the framework of the Service varies to fit the changing times.

OVERSEAS EMPLOYMENT

The functional purpose of the Department of State is now, and always has been, to serve the people of these United States by administering our foreign affairs.

To accomplish this purpose, as I have previously stated, the Department increased its operational units from 23 in 1913 to 113 in 1948—an expansion of 90 such units in 35 years. If this increase added to the efficiency of the Department in accomplishing its defined purpose, this increase was justified. On the contrary, if this increase did not add to the efficiency of the Department, the increase was not justified and the Department should be directed to eliminate excess functional units and combine those with like functions.

Approximately 2 years ago the Hoover Commission found that at least 46 Government agencies other than the Department of State were engaged in overseas operations and had overseas interests.

In their 1949 study, the Hoover Commission further discovered that of 193,000 Government employees overseas only 12,000 worked for the State Department. At the time of this study the Federal Works Agency had 459 workers overseas and the Federal Security Agency had 978 employees in 19 countries. There were then 743 United States civilian employees in the sparsely settled country of Libya.

The relegation of the Department of State to the background in foreign affairs had begun as far back as 1942 at the time of the gallant defense of Wake Island against the Japanese under the leadership of our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX]. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States in a June 25, 1951, statement points out that:

> When Wake Island was attacked by the Japanese, no one in Washington knew who had charge of it, although Navy, Interior, Commerce and State Departments had uncertain claims on it, and final determination was that Wake was a responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Whether the status of the State Department, as it now exists, is contrived chaos or accidental confusion is most difficult to determine. The answer is hidden in papers buried deep in our archives, in private libraries made inaccessible to Members of Congress and among those papers included in the micro films taken from Mr. Chambers' pumpkin.

Under these circumstances, it is necessary for me to resort to the device of questioning a composite of all our great Secretaries of State—a composite of men like Jefferson, Adams, Monroe, Hay, Root and Charles Evans Hughes. The same questions should be asked of any Secretary of State—whether or not a specific Secretary could qualify as to greatness.

THIS IS MY CATECHISM OF DIPLOMACY

Question: To whom is any employee of the Department of State—be he Secretary or messenger boy—responsible?

Answer: To the people of the United States of America. Such employees are subject to the Constitution and servants of the people. They cannot, according to their oath of office, serve the interests of any other nation—be that nation Russia or Britain, Rumania or Burma.

Question: What is the standing of our ambassadors and chiefs of mission abroad?

Answer: The standing of our diplomatic representatives abroad is the lowest in the history of this Republic. The State Department—as in the case of David and Saul—gives away its million. But ECA gives away its tens of millions. Our highest hope for our diplomatic representative abroad today is for him to be third high man on the Federal totem pole.

Question: What should be the guide of the Department of State when coming to Congress for appropriations?

Answer: The American battle-cry against the Barbary pirates in the first years of the nineteenth century: "Millions for defense, but not a cent for tribute."

Question: What should be the Department's policy in regard to securing other nations as our allies?

Answer: We should gain the respect of other nations. True respect may not be purchased. Any kind of respect which is for sale on the open market is not worth buying. True respect is a base product of true integrity. If true integrity is ours, a friendly nation cannot flatter us to our downfall nor may an enemy nation blackmail us into dishonor. Mercenaries are not last-ditch fighters. Allies through mutual respect are last-ditch fighters. When we get back our integrity in foreign affairs we will never lack for respect from our fellow nations.

Question: What can we do to regain the respect of other nations?

Answer: We can make it clear to all departments and agencies of the Federal Government that the accredited representatives of the State Department are in authority overseas. We can cut down in personnel of agencies other than the State Department employed abroad. We can turn down unnecessary foreign loans. We can refuse to give outright grants to solvent nations. We can summon up force, rather than pay ransom, to countries who unlawfully kidnap and otherwise abuse our citizens. We can keep our promises, made legitimately and in good faith, and we can insist on other nations meeting their obligations to us.

Question: What methods shall we use to insure the success of any campaign to regain the respect of nations?

Answer: This Nation once had the respect of nations. We had it because of the caliber of people who then worked for our State Department. We can have it again by insisting that the right kind of people be employed by our true representatives abroad.

Question: Would you place any one qualification above all other for service in the State Department?

Answer: Yes. I would demand that the first qualification be that the State Department officer know his own country—the United States of America. No man can represent this country fully unless he knows the full producing strength, the artistic, cultural, and educational contributions of each of the 48

States and of Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. Indians are no longer on the warpath 50 miles west of Hoboken. Nebraska is an arsenal of food crops—not, as it was once represented in one of the Department's articles for distribution in the Soviet Union—as a small part of the "Great American Desert." The ignorant should be sent to school; not sent abroad to misrepresent this vast Republic.

Question: What would you consider the second qualification of an able employee of the State Department?

Answer: Knowledge of an understanding about the country to which he is sent as the United States representative. He must be aware of the delicate shades of differences in the politics, social composition, and economics of the country in which he is assigned to serve us. He must know its history, its geography, its culture. A successful United States diplomat in Bolivia could well be a failure in Denmark. A successful diplomat in Denmark could well be a failure in India. The responsibility of issuing such assignments is great: but it is not impossible to meet that responsibility with tact and judgment.

Question: Is there a final requirement for service in the Department at home or in the Foreign Service abroad?

Answer: The final requirement is that of absolute loyalty to the United States. No person of even the hint of a divided loyalty should be permitted to serve in the Department in any capacity. Each employee from the Secretary down should be checked, double-checked, and triple-checked by the FBI and other agencies in authority. This Nation can ill afford treason, or even deflection, in these critical times.

Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State
Sail on, O Union, strong and great
Humanity with all its fears
With all the hopes of future years
Is hanging breathless on thy fate.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. First, I wish to ask the gentleman this question: When the chairman of the subcommittee was on the floor, I asked him to yield, and he declined to yield. Would the gentleman from Nebraska, who, in my opinion, has delivered one of the most masterful presentations on the operation of the Department of State that has gone into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the past 15 years, tell us about what length of time in weeks or months his distinguished committee has spent on the bill which we are now considering? Could the gentleman give us an approximate idea or statement of the length of time spent by his committee on this bill?

Mr. STEFAN. We went to work shortly after January 3. We had the bill ready to mark up for 2 months. I am sorry for the delay. I do not know the reason for it. Some of the Members have perhaps forgotten many of the things which were brought out in the hearings. I do not know the cause of the delay. We of the minority have had no responsibility for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not critical of that. But I would like to develop this point: A great many of us are criticized throughout the country in the columns and by radio commentators and in editorials because we do not spend much of our time in our districts. This morning I took the time to look through the Congressional Directory to find out the number of days the various sessions of the Congress have been in session, beginning with 1920 and coming down to date. It would be very interesting to you if you want to check on that to see how many days we have been in session.

But this is the question I want to ask the gentleman: As a member of your distinguished committee, who has rendered the kind of service which is reflected here in these hearings, and in the debate, will the gentleman state whether that could be done unless the members were on the job here in the Congress?

Mr. STEFAN. No. It was necessary for all members to stay here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They have to be here?

Mr. STEFAN. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And they could not be back in their districts, visiting, but they have to be here in the Congress or attending committee hearings? Does the gentleman agree on that?

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the gentleman's opinion that since 1939 or 1940 or 1942, whichever date you want to take, that the State Department of our Government has had a far wider scope in which to operate than ever before in the history of this country?

Mr. STEFAN. They have had a wider scope. Under several reorganizations, the Department has grown rapidly. The time has arrived for us to really give the State Department the position it actually deserves in world affairs in order to gain the respect of foreign governments. The demands on the Department are tremendous.

As I said a while ago, we have three or four or five Voices of America. It is not a matter of appropriations. It will never be effective until you coordinate this important operation. You have to have one Voice. ECA has more people in information in France than has the International Information, Voice of America of the Department of State, which is doing information work. GARIOA has information. There is a Free Voice of America. The occupied areas have an information service. NATO is going to have an information organization. There should be one coordinated Voice of America. It is badly needed. Further than that, on your general missions, in the regular diplomatic field, how can you have your chief of missions deal politically successfully with the representatives of a foreign government when another American official, armed with diplomatic status, plus funds to give away, bypasses your regular chief of missions?

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My next question is this: The gentleman has outlined very clearly, for me at least, the contrary influence that these various operations have against the policy the State Department might have. Would the gentleman go so far as to say that the State Department did have considerable influence, and by having Congress implement by authorizing and appropriating these other agencies, they are now somewhat cutting across the face of the State Department policy? In other words, did not the State Department back the Truman plan? Did not the State Department back the Marshall plan, and did not the State Department back the ECA operations?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In every instance. Now, to me, as I have watched these operations, that said in advance that these propositions would eventually lead us to great peril, if I may use that word, because I think it is a terrorizing peril to contemplate.

Mr. STEFAN. That is the peril I am talking about. If you do not put the Department of State and Foreign Service back to its original top position, you are going to continue gaining the disrespect of foreign governments, and making the Department of State and the Foreign Service impotent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. We have got to strengthen your Department of State.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. COX. I have asked the gentleman to yield that I might give applause to this very patriotic, this eloquent, dramatic, and informative statement which he has made.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. I regret that all Members of the House were not here to hear it. They would be inspired by the remarks which the gentleman has made.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I, too, would like to compliment the gentleman upon his statement. I would like to ask him a double-barrel question, if I may. Can the gentleman tell me the pay and allowances of Ambassadors and their classifications, and who determines their classifications?

Mr. STEFAN. The determination is made by the Secretary of State. We have four classes of Ambassadors: first, second, third, and fourth. As I recall it, the class 1 Ambassador receives a stipend of $25,000 a year, with allowances. I think it goes to $20,000 for class 2; $17,500 for class 3, and $15,000 for class 4. We once had many more Ministers than Ambassadors, but in Central and South America where, under protocol, most of the foreign countries had Ambassadors there, we made it possible for our Ministers to become Ambassadors, with the understanding that they would receive the salaries of ministers, which is $15,000.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us who determines those classifications?

Mr. STEFAN. The Secretary of State. Of course, in consultation with other officials.

Mr. GROSS. How do the allowances run?

Mr. STEFAN. They vary. The largest allowance I think in amount would be the Ambassador to the Court of St. James', $25,000 salary, plus about $28,178 allowances.

Mr. GROSS. How much?

Mr. STEFAN. $28,178 for allowances. In Paris I think the salary is $25,000, with an additional $24,400 for allowances. It is on a sliding scale based on the importance of the mission.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, we are being very liberal with them, are we not?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; I think we are.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman from Nebraska has made one of the finest statements we have heard on the floor in a long time, and he has pointed out very cogently one of the most serious difficulties that our Department of State has had in our foreign representation, namely, that the heads of mission are in effect subordinate to other phases of the Government operating in the foreign field. I take it the gentleman believes that these people who are representing other agencies of the Government should do their business through the Ambassadors, rather than separately. What does the gentleman think?

Mr. STEFAN. They should do it through the chief of our mission. We should have only one chief American representative in a foreign country; otherwise his foreign counterpart will bypass the accredited American chief of mission.

Mr. HINSHAW. And the chief of mission is the Ambassador?

Mr. STEFAN. The Ambassador or Minister; yes.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. WERDEL. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks very much and join with the others in thanking him for the attention he has given to the subject. I wonder if the gentleman can give us some detail about the efforts of the State Department in cleaning up and releasing people who are bad security risks and for homosexuality.

Mr. STEFAN. I think they are doing a good job. I was told recently that 20 had been separated from the service because of social reasons, and others were under investigation. Some additional ones are being released. Mr. Humelsine, the Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, assisted by Mr. Sam Boykin, his assistant, are doing an excellent job. They are using the McCarran rider along with all the authority they presently have, to do it. I know they want to get rid of all bad security risks, and they are doing a good job; but I do not know how much authority they have in certain cases.

Mr. WERDEL. Additional bad security risks have been found since the last report was filed; is that right?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. We are indebted to our colleague for a splendid talk on the State Department. I should like to ask a question prompted by something Dean Rusk said in the hearings, page 158. He indicated that we were working toward a situation in Korea that would permit us to pull our forces out; just what did he mean by that?

Mr. STEFAN. I questioned Mr. Rusk during the hearings at some length on that, getting him to admit that we were in fact at war in Korea. I think the fact is that at that time it was a question of whether or not we were going to be chased out. But the long policy is, of course, to get out of Korea if we can get the North Koreans and South Koreans together so that all foreign forces can eventually get out, so there will be a peaceful Korean Republic. I think that is what Mr. Rusk had in mind. I did not get the idea that he meant to get out while fighting was going on. At that time, he said "We were going to stay there if we can."

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Then his statement was not exactly in line with recent happenings.

Mr. STEFAN. No; those hearings were held some time ago.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Are there any war potentials going to Russia and her satellites through ECA and other means?

Mr. STEFAN. Through ECA?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Or otherwise.

Mr. STEFAN. We get more information on that through Mr. Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce, when he comes before us, because the export control is located in the Department of Commerce. Mr. Sawyer indicated that there was considerable going there. He said they had considerable trouble in checking the reshipments after the arms and munitions got over to these countries, Britain and other countries who were getting Marshall-plan aid. They were charged with using some of our money for building factories which made potential war materials, and there were some transshipments; but now I understand the Export Controls Division has representatives over there and they are getting considerable cooperation from the people who are the beneficaries of our charity.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does the gentleman know offhand how many the Voice of America employs?

Mr. STEFAN. I gave it to the gentleman. They are asking for over 14,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. They spend a quarter of a million dollars a day.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, they had $121,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951. They are asking for $115,000,000 for 1952. The committee cut that down to $85,000,000, but they are over in the Senate asking for another $90,000,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The $85,000,000 is approximately a quarter of a million dollars a day?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, is there any reason why it should go higher than that with only that many employees?

Mr. STEFAN. The committee did not think so because the committee not only cut them from $115,000,000 down to $85,000,000, but cut them $10,000,000 in another item. We cut that agency $40,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished and able gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to make this observation in connection with the very subject the gentleman is now discussing and which I omitted to make when I had the floor earlier during this debate. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] contended that in this reduction of the Voice of America appropriation from $115,000,000 to $85,000,000 that activity would wind up with over $100,000,000 for 1952. He claimed there was a carry-over of some $15,000,000. There was a carry-over of $15,000,000, but not one cent of that money is for operating expenses. That is and was for capital outlay previously voted in connection with the acquisition of electronic equipment.

Mr. STEFAN. Also for some construction.

Mr. ROONEY. The point is that none of it is for operation or personnel of the Voice of America. So that when we made this cut from $115,000,000 to $85,000,000, it was a straight out-and-out substantial $30,000,000 cut.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his very good research work and his excellent statement. There is one other question to which I would like to address myself. For a number of years, as a matter of fact for most of our history, we have made the unfortunate mistake of appointing men to these ambassadorial posts because of wealth rather than because of knowledge, is that not so?

Mr. STEFAN. That is something over which the gentleman and I have no control and over which the committee has no control. Our committee has always favored career service and also endeavored to the best of our ability to help those in the lower brackets who are in the noncareer service to improve their status. The gentleman is absolutely right. Because a man has a tremendous amount of money, he has contributed a lot of money to the Democratic or Republican campaign fund, he is rewarded with a post. Therefore we have to depend upon our career service men to hold up his arms when he does represent us in some foreign countries.

The gentleman might be glad to know that over 65 percent of those in the service are career people. We are rapidly approaching the point when eventually the two great political parties will see

that it is best to have a career man, an experienced man, to represent us in a foreign country rather than to reward someone because he is rich or influential.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I am well aware that is true and I want to put that in the RECORD. Somebody said, I believe, that these are well paying positions. In regard to the cost of keeping these embassies open, many of the men are spending more money than they are receiving.

Mr. STEFAN. Let me tell the gentleman that the Foreign Service is the best paid service in the United States. The individual is better taken care of than any other Foreign Service in the world.

Mr. BURNSIDE. But the cost is high for the people in these major diplomatic posts.

Mr. STEFAN. We take care of that. We take care of his rent, his living allowances, the differential in living, and if he goes to a cold climate, we even give him clothes and hospitalization. We give him service that no other employee of the Federal Government in the United States gets, and they are pretty well satisfied. We try to improve the service and try to make it attractive.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I am not speaking of the general run; I am speaking about the ambassadorial positions in the larger countries.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, $25,000 plus about $28,000 for allowances is not so bad, is it?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Is it not a fact, though, that they have to entertain many officials in this Foreign Service?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, they have to, and sometimes they overentertain. We called attention to the fact that many times they entertain themselves more than they should.

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

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

Mr. BOW. Along the line that we have been discussing of the pay that ambassadors get, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] raised the question that the Secretary-General of the United Nations receives a salary of $40,000 a year. Would the gentleman care to comment or give his views on whether $40,000 is too much for the Secretary-General of the United Nations?

Mr. STEFAN. Well, we do not pay all of that. That is a cooperative venture. We pay a certain percentage.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman tell us how much we do pay of that amount?

Mr. STEFAN. We pay about 38 percent. Mr. Warren Austin, chief delegate of the United States to the United Nations, has done an excellent job of cutting that percentage down.

Mr. BOW. Did we not at one time pay about 70 percent?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, in some cases. We are getting that down, too.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman say how many members of the United Nations are now in arrears in their payments to the United Nations?

Mr. STEFAN. I think we have some of that information in the hearings, if the gentleman will forgive me for not taking the time to go into that question now to answer him. He will find that in the hearings.

Mr. BOW. Would the gentleman care to comment on whether $40,000 is adequate to the Secretary General?

Mr. STEFAN. I could not comment on that.

Mr. Chairman, if the committee will forgive me, I have consumed an hour of time and there are others that want to speak. I will be glad to answer further questions when we read the bill under the 5-minute rule, because I have other statements to make at that time.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, there is little point in my reiterating what the previous speakers have had to say about this bill. It carries approximately $1,051,715,000 which, I might mention in passing, is ten times what it was 10 years ago and about twice what it was 5 years ago. A substantial portion of the increase is occasioned by the very controversial Department of State total appropriations for which as recently as 1942 were only some $38,000,000. While this over-all cut for the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Departments is probably the highest of all the various bills, it is not enough, nor in the right places.

In considering the appropriations of the various branches of the Government from year to year, the committee seeks to apply a yardstick to the activities concerned, in an effort to determine what the accomplishments have been and to relate those accomplishments to the dollars requested with the ultimate aim of providing the maximum benefit for the least number of dollars, consistent with the current condition of the public purse.

In attempting to apply this technique, however, to the Department of State, we seek in vain for the yardstick to apply. Just how would you determine, in your own conscience, the benefits that have accrued to this country in the last 10 years as a result of the operations of our Department of State?

The State Department is expected to protect the interest of the United States in world affairs and to promote those policies that will lead to and insure the peace. Thus in seeking the yardstick to apply, we must examine our relative position in world affairs at this time. If this then is our criterion, we must conclude that the Department of State has been an abysmal failure.

None will disagree with the fact that our basic policy at this time should be the containment of communism as a means of securing the peace, yet we find that in the past few years the Russian menace has grown from a relatively insignificant factor to a colossus that now dominates over one-fifth of the area of the world and rules the lives of some 800,000,000 people. One by one the countries have fallen—Rumania, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the most tragic of all, our old friend in the East, China.

I do not impugn the motives of men and for the sake of argument, I am willing to concede that the sell-out of China was due to incompetence and not necessarily to disloyalty. The motives and the reasons are all behind us and all that remains is the hard, cold fact that our diplomacy has failed, and is failing, and will fail under a system that plays politics with blood and flesh.

In former Congresses, I was proud to be reminded from time to time of the advice of George Washington, when, on the occasion of his farewell address, he warned posterity of the dangers inherent in any foreign alliances. To speak of this now and to quote the great Washington is interpreted as the rankest heresy by the one-worlders and internationalists who would spill our blood and spend our sustenance in the quarrels of the world whose problems we seek to solve. Yes, you rarely find a man in the well of the House today with the courage to quote the great Washington on foreign policy. To do so makes one vulnerable to the smear press who hangs heinous phrases around your neck. Isolationist and obstructionist is the kindest name calling one can expect under these circumstances. I often wonder what George Washington would say about all of this.

With the exception of our venture in the Spanish-American War, we got along pretty well by minding our own business until the Democratic administration adopted the doctrine that we hear so much today, known as collective security, which precipitated us into World War I and sowed the seeds of continued interference into the lives of people living in the remotest sections of the world.

Then we started to playing footsie with the League of Nations and gradually became so committed internationally that we wound up with World War II and destroyed the evil dictators of the world, and in the process, underwrote the greatest dictator of them all, thereby putting us into a crisis infinitely worse than we faced before the Second World War.

On January 6, 1941, President Roosevelt proclaimed the "four freedoms," laying down the noble objective of our tragic adventure as freedom of speech and worship and from want and fear, yet abrogated them all in an appeasement of Russia in international conferences that will cry out in history as the crime of the ages. This led to world war III and, while the administration insists it is a police action, I call anything where casualties are numbered in the hundreds of thousands nothing less than war.

This, then, is the inevitable result of collective security. The phrase makers may call me an isolationist, an obstructionist, an American firster, or some other alleged smear; but if such a phrase labels me as one who is sick at heart at the betrayal of our own people, and one who does not believe in the doctrine that perpetual peace may only be maintained by everlasting war, I accept the title.

Collective security means we pick up the check. Since we cannot place a

value on the death and maiming and the suffering of our people, the only statistic left is the dollar value of our adventure in world diplomacy, and I leave it to you to determine what this mass destruction has done to the finest country God ever put on the earth—stripping us of timber, copper, lead, zinc, oil, iron, and other natural resources, exhausting our soil through overcropping and lack of fertilizers.

We spent billions in prosecuting World War I and in reconstructing the countries of not only our allies, but our enemies as well. What do we have to show for it over 30 years after the armistice? A lot of bills long overdue.

We still carry on our books the debts of World War I. What a lot of silly bookkeeping. Over $16,000,000,000 still due and unpayable, including $5,000,000,000 from France and $7,000,000,000 from Great Britain.

So, in furtherance of our collective security we proceeded to give away and loan during and after World War II over $79,000,000,000 more. Lend-lease, what an empty phrase. It cost us over $48,000,000,000. This was a loan to our friends, but who is there among you so naive as to think that it will be repaid? We cannot even collect interest on World I indebtedness, let alone anything from World War II. We gave them the Marshall plan, civilian supplies, UNRRA, mutual-defense assistance, special British loans, Export-Import Bank loans, and all of the other schemes that were to save the world. Still we find the world is far from being saved. Yes, I know many will say we would have been worse off if we had not bankrupted ourselves in these wild fanciful dreams. To that I say—how could we have been? The Communist orbit now embraces 35 percent of the world's population and one-fifth of the world area. How stupid can we get? Conceding that some of these expenditures, such as relief feeding, and so forth, might have some justification, how far can we go in dollar diplomacy? Think what these sums would have done to keep our defenses strong and invulnerable. Think what these sums would mean to our arsenal, our stockpile, and the very dynamics that keep a free enterprise strong through a low tax rate and a sound dollar that would permit our people to work and plan in the complete security that is their birthright.

What has happened to these vast sums that have been poured around the world? How much of it has been expropriated by the very enemy we seek to contain? Since less than two billion of the seventy-nine billion has been paid back, what has happened to the rest? Has it secured the world? How many guns has it produced and what assurance do we have that they will be used with us and not against us? How many of an army has General Eisenhower produced and is the will to fight a strong force with our allies?

We cannot bleed, and I mean literally, for the entire world. There are over 2,000,000,000 people in this wide world and we just cannot take them all to dinner. Collective security commits us to bankruptcy, and let us not be lulled by the fact that we ended this fiscal year with a temporary surplus. We are committed to bills as yet unpaid that may well create the blackest financial crisis in history. Our people cry for sanity in foreign affairs and just a little regard for our own welfare. In answer to their cry, they are offered dollar diplomacy and an administration that acts on whim, fancy, and in a fit of temper deprives the Nation of the services of the greatest military leader of the twentieth century.

Now they say collective security will bring us peace in Korea. Another Soviet trap that will engineer a peace at the thirty-eighth parallel and create another encircled, occupied Berlin that will nail down still another large segment of our military might, while Stalin strokes his chin to decide where the next incident will be. Will it be Germany? Yugoslavia? Iran?

I do not want to build a great wall around these precious shores, but I do want a bulwark of defense that will deter any greedy eye which may glance this way. I assuredly do not want a bunch of wild-eyed dreamers constantly thinking up new and novel ways of extracting from us the things they envy and covet. It is enough that we have subsidized the socialization of the world. Let us pull in a little and save what we have left.

How international minded would the countries of the world be if we were out of cash? Is this collective security a two-way street? Of course not. England and all of the countries abroad are truly isolationist and lend lip service to collective security only as long as they collect from us.

We have a lot to do at home. Instead of squandering these huge funds in giveaway programs abroad, let us try to balance the budget. Let us return to a sound dollar and get some of this money back in the hands of our own people and our States so that we can provide for the old and indigent. Let us build our defenses through building and maintaining a strong economy. Instead of throwing feathers at communism abroad, let us throw bricks at it at home. I am reminded that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover recently estimated there were 54,000 Communists in this country; and remember that this represents the hard core only and does not include the dupes and intellectual dopes who subscribe to communism and call themselves good Americans. Fifty-four thousand Communists is one for every 2,700 citizens or one for every 900 taxpayers. It is something to think about. If my recollection serves me correctly, the Russian revolution was successful with one Communist member for every 2,200 citizens. It all depends on where they are and I wonder if we know where all of these 54,000 are today. How many of them are in government—Federal, State, or local. How many in defense industry. I do not know. I wish I did.

The legislative committees of the House should give more thought to the authorizations they make. Our subcommittee can only make superficial savings. Since the Korean war, we have passed three more great tax bills. The last one was the largest ever, yet this bill falls short by $1,600,000,000 of covering the one proposal for foreign aid. Ohio's share is $487,000,000, or more than our State government spends for our 8,000,000 people. Two thousand dollars per family of four for the national tax bill alone is breaking the taxpayers' backs. Many of these taxes are cleverly concealed in packages of food and clothing and often amount to more than the cost of the goods, then Congress is charged with failing to stop inflation and the deception becomes complete.

In conclusion, and above all, let us discard this doctrine of collective security and go back to the advice of George Washington. To the taxpayer, collective security is mostly "collective," and least secure.

I want to reminisce for about a half a minute to the time when I was about 18 years old, and just getting to feel like a citizen of the United States. I remember an American citizen by the name of Perdicardis was captured by some bandit who held him for ransom in the Near East. I remember how this country perked up and what an uplift it gave us all when Theodore Roosevelt sent one simple little message to bring out Perdicardis alive or Rasuli dead. He came out alive the next day.

As we think about it, when a member of the American Press Association is being held captive, I pray that the spirit of Theodore Roosevelt might return to the State Department of the United States and we will once more take the position that America should be jealous of her rights and ready to maintain them.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, this House has an obligation to the taxpayers to search out every case of wasteful spending by the Government and to end that kind of spending. I direct the Members' attention to an item of $1,312,100 for program evaluation service in the budget presented to the Appropriations Committee by the Voice of America. I wish to proceed on the premise that I am a strong advocate of advertising but from my business experience I cannot condone such an extravagant program. Businesses throughout this country would go broke if they spent one-tenth as much evaluating the effect of their promotion and advertising as they do in direct expenditures. Imagine the American Tobacco Co. adopting such a policy. The Voice people try to justify this expenditure of $1,312,100 by saying it was the only way they could find out whether the Voice programs were accomplishing anything. The Voice was requesting $10,226,433 for operation of its radio programs which means that for every $10 spent for operating the radio programs the Voice wanted to spend a dollar for evaluating the programs.

We need only to look at world conditions today to realize the ineffectiveness of the Voice programs. To think that we are spending the taxpayers' money to evaluate the ineffectiveness is just plain silly. Members of the House

will obtain some idea of the money involved in the individual contracts from the fact that one contract with International Public Opinion Research is in the amount of $84,995.

I salute all advertising men for their accomplishments in this world of ours. The advertising man is worthy of far greater recognition than he receives. He has been content thus far to stand in the background and let the so-called captains of industry take all the bows for America's great productive power. But what makes such production possible? It is the advertising man who, with his persuasive words, causes people to want more and more of the things that are produced in such tremendous quantities. Without the demand and consumption thus induced, production would not be possible on its present scale.

Advertising men have given of their talents to create and sustain a public opinion favorable to worthy civic endeavors, all of which has been done without expense to the projects involved. It is a manifestation of public spirit worthy of high commendation. These advertising geniuses would gladly give of their time and knowledge to establish a program that would convince others that our way of life is best.

Within the American way we have the best product in the world. Our difficulty has been that we hired the wrong sales manager to sell our product.

I suggest this House establish a committee to consider an effective Voice program. I, for one, would be anxious to serve on such a committee. Just because the present operation has been a failure does not mean that it could not be very effective and very economical. It must be operated independent of the State Department with the State Department doing nothing more than acting as a censor.

Up to the present time there has been no justification for the vast sums that have been spent. If the creativeness and ingenuity of the advertising and promotion men of America is used it would not be necessary to spend thousands of dollars to evaluate their work. The results would be known immediately. They are trained and possess the necessary know-how to sell their product.

It is not necessary to spend a dollar in evaluating the Voice of America. Just stop all appropriations as soon as possible and let a committee made up of Members of this House establish an overall American sales program.

We have had an Un-American Activities Committee for quite some time. I suggest we have a pro-America.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute. Will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. ROONEY. I merely want to make sure that the gentleman is acquainted with the amount of money requested of the committee for research and evaluation. What does the gentleman understand to be the amount of money in the budget request for research and evaluation?

Mr. AYRES. I am basing this on what I understand to be their request, $1,000,000, or they are trying to justify the expenditure of $1,312,100 to evaluate what they have done.

Mr. ROONEY. Where did the gentleman get that information?

Mr. AYRES. It has been by direct contact with one of the members who was making the request.

Mr. ROONEY. One of the members?

Mr. AYRES. I am not free to divulge the individual.

Mr. ROONEY. I am rather surprised that the Republican National Committee was so grossly misinformed, because there was a request of $3,531,600 for research and evaluation. If the gentleman wants to fire a shot why not take a good shot?

Mr. AYRES. Is the gentleman inferring that this figure was given to me by the Republican National Committee?

Mr. ROONEY. I practically made the direct statement to that effect.

Mr. AYRES. Well, if that is the gentleman's claim I would like to inform him that he is wrong. You quoted the figures yourself on page 844 of the hearings.

Mr. ROONEY. I cannot understand where else you could get a speech written around the figure $1,312,100 when the fact of the matter is it should be $3,531,600. The amount $2,219,500 requested for research and evaluation studies, overseas missions activities, was omitted. You'll find that at page 1036.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. AYRES. Would the gentleman answer a question for me?

Mr. ROONEY. I will try to.

Mr. AYRES. Does the gentleman condone the spending of one-tenth of every dollar to evaluate the effectiveness of that dollar spent?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not condone any such thing, I must say to the gentleman. He is finding fault as I have for some time. It was this committee that cut the recent supplemental request of the Voice of America by 90 percent. But is it improper to expect that proper and dependable evaluation and research at a reasonable cost be made into the effectiveness of the program? Does not the gentleman think that that is one way we can find out whether or not the Voice of America is effective and doing a good job?

Mr. AYRES. I felt for some time, I may say to the gentleman from New York, prior to coming to Congress that we could put forth a very effective program if we had the right men running it and the right type of program.

Mr. ROONEY. Since the gentleman has been here and for some time previous to that I have been highly critical of the operations of the Voice of America. But my criticisms have been constructive criticisms. Does the gentleman from Ohio want to cure the patient by cutting his head off?

Mr. AYRES. You cannot make it operate if we are to follow the same line it has been operating on in the past.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will follow the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] on his side of the aisle, one of the ablest Members of this House, who for 12 years has served on this very subcommittee dealing with the Department of State, the gentleman would be better informed than whoever it was, and he does not care to divulge the name, who gave him the figures he referred to a while ago.

Mr. AYRES. I feel confident this figure is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentleman that the figure is incorrect.

Mr. AYRES. I again refer you to page 844 of the hearings.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is just a little conservative in his statement.

Mr. AYRES. If I have been too conservative I will correct that, too, but I have quoted the figures Mr. ROONEY gave.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I infer that the gentleman has great faith in the value of advertising?

Mr. AYRES. I do.

Mr. ADAIR. Is it the gentleman's opinion that if we were to try to advertise our system of government on a basis comparable to the manner in which we advertise our commercial products in this country we could be successful in that?

Mr. AYRES. I feel confident that we could. We have to come down to the level of the people we are dealing with. They are not particularly interested in our form of government when we just say our form is best. However, we have to prove to them that we are interested in them. For instance, I have felt for a long time that if we could get to the children of these foreign countries it would be very effective. All of you who run for Congress know you are guilty of flattery when you say to a child, "You are about the prettiest child I have ever seen." Please the child and you please the parents. The same thing applies wherever human nature takes its course. There are literally thousands of ways to get at the root of the thing and start pleasing the children of these people to make them believe that we are really good Americans, and our way of life is best.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Com-

merce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ADEQUATE DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 4607 on June 26, 1951. My bill is identical with H. R. 4571, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN]. These bills had for their purpose the drawing together under one head all agencies dealing with the mining industry and the Government stockpile program.

Last September this Congress, in approving the Defense Production Act of 1950, provided the executive branch of the Government with the authority and means to encourage the exploration and development of mines to produce the metals and minerals needed to sustain our industrial might.

As of today, however, there seems to be little realization in the administrative branch of the Government of the importance of vitalizing and expanding our domestic mining industry. All that has been done to date is to divide, among a maze of some 40 agencies and committees, piecemeal authority over operation of the minerals program recommended by Congress.

I am not a mining man. I represent a great farming area which has not a single mine within its confines. My constituents have only a cursory interest in mining—and that to the extent that it provides the metals to produce the farm implements and the fuel to heat homes and aid them in conduct of their day-to-day farming operations, and for adequate national defense. I have taken a great personal interest in the development of a strong domestic mining industry since I had the opportunity, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee, to work on the drafting and the enactment into law of the Stockpiling Act, both in 1939 and in 1946.

The members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee have accorded me the honor of permitting me to sit with them during the course of their searching investigations of the conduct of the minerals program in the present defense effort. This has been a revealing experience. You have heard them discuss their findings on this floor many times.

To me, the confused situation which exists in the minerals program is little short of catastrophic. The truth of the matter is we face a disaster approaching that suffered at Pearl Harbor and no one is doing anything about it. As at Pearl Harbor, we have a divided authority in our defense set-up with the result that nothing is being accomplished but a continual passing of the buck from one agency to another. This administrative inertia is further complicated by the fact that the many agencies involved in dealing with our metal and mineral production seek to outdo each other in bottlenecking the programs that have been initiated while they zealously guard their own administrative authority.

Frankly, gentlemen, that master of confusion, Joseph Stalin, could not have done a better job of preventing the speedy acceleration of mining in the United States.

Let us look at the record. In the period since last September only seven domestic contracts have been entered into by the Government for purchase of metals. Some progress had been made in making loans for exploration. As of June 30, the Government had provided just short of $3,000,000 for this purpose although the Defense Production Administration had set aside $10,000,000 for the past fiscal year. That is the net accomplishment for more than 9 months of operating under the Defense Production Act. It is a sorry record.

As a result what have we added to the productive capacity of our mines? Have we increased the supply of manganese, of chromium, of tungsten, of cobalt, of copper, lead and zinc, and of the host of other metals so necessary to the production of jet aircraft, of tanks, submarines, and the countless other implements of defense? Gentlemen, that question may be answered in one word—"No." And the worst is yet to come. We have been living off of the fat of our minerals and metals supply. We shall shortly be living hand-to-mouth. The impact of the defense production program has not yet reached its peak, but when it does our defense program administrators are going to wake up and find that it will bog down because of the lack of the basic raw materials needed to keep industrial production going. Just how far are you going to get in the production of jet engines without an adequate supply of tungsten, chromium, nickel, cobalt, and columbium?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. It is a fact that very, very recently the miners in my district at Mackay, Idaho, very close to one of the most promising tungsten properties in the State of Idaho, were told by one of the representatives of the bureaucracy in Washington that they might just as well go down to Nevada and play the slot machines as continue any longer attempting to produce tungsten in Idaho.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution, because it is in line with my own observations here. I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

I may add there that blueprints do not shoot, and you are not going to win any future combat in the air unless you have those jets off the drawing board. They are not going to get off the drawing boards unless we get these particular metals on hand and coming along in sufficient quantity.

Then we shall see a mad scramble to reshuffle authority over mineral production, a rush of new programs intended to bring out metals and minerals, and no doubt, a myriad of explanations as to why this action had not taken place before. And further, when this starvation diet of metals occurs, it will be accompanied by lay-offs at industrial plants, the migration of labor to other jobs, a loss of payrolls, and howls by labor for action—action which should have been taken months ago.

Another illustration I could add here at this point of my own is this. We wrote the Stockpile Act into law and it was signed by the President on July 23, 1946. We set up a 5-year program intending to acquire enough of these strategic and critical materials so that when war should strike we would not be caught entirely short.

After 4 years of that, on July 23, 1950, the stockpile had acquired only about 34 percent of that yardstick or goal, and after the war started in Korea we found the officials in charge of that program suddenly upped the yardstick to nearly double of what it had been prior to that. That is exactly contrary to what we had in mind when we wrote the stockpile law in 1946. We intended to have enough acquired by the time that war came so that we would not have to do that very thing. But at that time they had only about 34 percent of the stockpile program on the smaller budget or yardstick that they had set prior to the Korean war.

I could cite numerous examples of the bottlenecks in the minerals and metals program, but I shall not bore you with their details. Many of you are more familiar with specific cases than I am. However, I would like to point out some of the stumbling blocks that hamper the minerals program and make mining men throw up their hands in disgust. I have literally run around in circles from one agency to another vainly trying to get accurate information and effective action.

I might add at this point the observation that in my opinion those of us who wrote the Stockpile Act recognize in paragraph 1 of that act, which is Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, that the health of the domestic mining industry was of greater importance than the stockpile. They are both important, but the health of the domestic mining industry is of greater importance to our self-sufficiency, national defensewise, than the stockpile itself.

In the first place, there are no clear-cut requirements for metals and minerals. The Munitions Board has not figured out the military requirements for these raw materials. Goals set by the Munitions Board were retained at less than $4,000,000,000 total throughout the first 4 years of their administration of Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Stockpile Act. Then after the Korean war broke the goal was raised to $8,870,000,000 by December 31, 1950. The uncertainty and confusion is rampant. That is a serious indictment of failure of the Munitions Board to grasp their responsibility and their duty under that act. Therefore, the other agencies are somewhat at a loss as to their goals. Despite this fact, however, they have not made any real concrete progress because of inertia, policy tifts,

and out-and-out jealousy over their various prerogatives. The Defense Minerals Administration, staffed by mining industry men anxious to get a program going, has been hobbled in its efforts by a group in the Secretary of the Interior's office who have become masters of the tactics of delaying important policy decisions and minerals development programs—although none of them have had any experience in mining. At the present time this group is still sitting on programs submitted by DMA months ago. Programs that are not bottlenecked at this point become pigeonholed in the General Services Administration, where at the present time many long-term purchase contracts lie dormant, while the Nation cries for the materials these contracts would bring out. Another agency, equally guilty in preventing mineral development, is the Office of Price Stabilization. Failure to face up to realities and set ceiling prices for metals and minerals in line with the world markets has caused much-needed metals to flow to other nations, and has kept mines closed in our own country that only need an adequate and firm price to unlock their hidden wealth.

Is it therefore little wonder that a mining official recently said, "Anything that's been accomplished by the metals industry in the past year has been in spite of the Government and not because of it"?

It is high time that Congress forcibly express its views on what needs to be done to bring order out of this chaos in the minerals program, to remove the uncertainty that exists, and stimulate our domestic mining industry.

In my own mind the simple solution that can be readily arrived at under existing law is for all mineral policies and program to be developed by one agency, directed by that agency, and brought to conclusion by that agency. It is my suggestion that a top mining man be made responsible for development of mineral policy and programs. To aid him in this work the policy and program functions as they apply to metals and minerals, now lodged in the Interior Department should be divorced from that Department and placed under this one responsible man who should be given full authority to direct the various other major agencies participating in any minerals program to carry out DPA policies and get the domestic mining industry into full production. This top minerals staff, which must be manned by experienced mining personnel, could be placed directly in the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Gentlemen, we are at the crossroads in our mineral preparedness. Even now it may be too late to salvage our production program, but there is an outside chance that we can get our mineral program on the right track. Let us hope, that for our national security, that those in charge of our defense will quickly see the light and take the needed steps now to insure a strong domestic mining industry.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa in again bringing to the attention of the Congress the situation that we face in connection with strategic and critical materials and their production and beneficiation in this country. We have held numerous hearings, not only in Washington but throughout the country, on the matter, and the situation you have described is universal, not only in Washington but in other places. We have tried in various ways to get this program started, and up to date it has not rolled. I think the gentleman is performing a real service in again calling the attention of Congress to the difficulties we are having in developing our domestic production of these critical and strategic materials for the war effort. We must get this program started and every one of us should help in the splendid effort the gentleman is making.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for his splendid observation. I have had occasion to visit the Committee on Mines, on which the gentleman serves. I have had occasion to observe his work on the floor of this House, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] has made a real contribution to this effort and has rendered invaluable service to our Nation. I know the gentleman from Montana realizes, as I do, that this is point one, where we start our own rating in the family of nations, and without the mining industry we would be absolutely rated as a have not nation, and would be rated at the bottom of the ladder. It is only as we get ourselves squared away with a vigorous, healthy mining industry that we can maintain our position in the family of nations.

I want to commend the gentleman very highly for his own work in this field.

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

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION MEETING

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to make an announcement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by Vice President BARKLEY, who is also president of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union, to notify the House that there will be a meeting held in his office in the Capitol, the old Supreme Court Chamber, at 10:30 o'clock Thursday morning. All persons interested are invited to be present at that time. At that meeting officers will be elected and delegates will be selected.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SCUDDER and to include an editorial in two instances.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and to include an address by the president of Yale University.

Mr. ARMSTRONG and to include a brief discussion on the Booker T. Washington Memorial.

Mr. POULSON in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS and to include an editorial.

Mrs. BOLTON on the effect of the OPS general overriding regulation No. 15, and to include a Wall Street Journal editorial as well as several letters.

Mr. RAMSAY and to include an editorial appearing in the Fairmont Times.

Mr. PERKINS in two instances, and to include an editorial appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $225.50.

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Mr. MANSFIELD and to include material from the Yellowstone News.

Mr. PRICE (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) in two instances and to include certain material.

Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. ANDREWS and to include an editorial.

Mr. BECKWORTH and to include some figures with reference to cotton.

Mr. GATHINGS in two instances, one on the question of installment credit and in the other to include an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LARCADE in three instances, and in one to include an article entitled "The Rains Descended, and the Floods Came"; in the second an article by Mr. Richard B. Frost, published in the Detroiter Board of Commerce on July 3, 1951; and in the third extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. BUFFETT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HINSHAW to extend the remarks which he expects to make in Committee of the Whole on the State Department appropriation bill and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDERSON of California and to include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEFAN and to include extraneous matter in connection with any remarks he shall make in Committee of the Whole on the State, Commerce, and Justice Department appropriation bill.

Mr. MILLER of California in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. O'KONSKI and to include an article.

Mr. ROONEY and to include extraneous matter in the remarks which he shall make in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) and to include an editorial appearing in the Brooklyn Tablet.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. JENISON and to include a statement.

Mr. BRAMBLETT and to include a statement by Robert L. Ryan, engineer-manager of the Ventura flood-control district.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include letters I received typical of many that have come to my office relative to House Resolution 332, regarding the Oatis case.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LOVRE (at the request of Mr. BERRY), indefinitely, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 24, 1951, 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:

627. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell and convey to Sam Arvanitis and George Arvanitis a parcel of land consisting of one-quarter acre, more or less, situated at the Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif."; to the Committee on Armed Services.

628. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill authorizing and directing the performance of an agreement with the Republic of Panama regarding the relocation of the terminal facilities of the Panama Railroad in the city of Panama"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

629. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4912. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4913. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities urgently and immediately needed for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4914. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4915. A bill to amend section 2151 of title 18, United States Code, relating to sabotage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 4916. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4923. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi Tunnel and its approach roads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to provide that the dramatic production Faith of Our Fathers shall be presented in each State of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. Res. 351. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Armed Services to conduct thorough studies and investigations concerning the sale to and use of narcotics by members of the Armed Forces and persons registered for induction by the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 4917. A bill for the relief of Giovannina Echelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4918. A bill for the relief of Henry J. Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4919. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jalal Elahi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 4920. A bill for the relief of Georgette Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Silas B. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4922. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

358. The SPEAKER presented a petition of V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., relative to transmitting a statement of the Control Yuan of China relating to the text of the draft on the Japanese peace treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 24, 1951

Rev. William F. Creighton, rector, St. John's Episcopal Church, Bethesda, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast sent the spirit of truth unto us to guide us into all truth, so rule our lives by Thy power that we may be truthful in word and act and thought.

Amidst all the half truths and falsehood by which men live keep us ever in Thy gracious protection, that no fear of ours or ambition of ours may make us false in act or speech.

Grant that our Nation may enthrone the truth which alone can make us free. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 23, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed a bill (H. R. 4262) relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4262) relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact routine business, without debate.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DISPLACED PERSONS

A confidential letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States of displaced persons (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN

Two letters from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States for shore leave purposes only, of certain alien