Orris F. Haynie, O1115626.
Alvin S. Jacobs, O2003075.
Robert J. McCaffree, O1883661.
John E. McGlone, O1878758.
Carlisle R. Petty, Jr., O2030506.
Kenneth R. Rogers, O2104126.
John I. Smith, O1878923.
William J. Storey, O1881534.
James G. White, Jr., O2204475.
Earle C. Williams, O2004312.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Curtiss M. Bailey	John H. Lewis
Parry Barnes, Jr.	William J. Lillis
Herbert J. Bickel, Jr.	Alfred C. Malmgren
Clarence A. Brest, Jr.	Raymond F. McGuire,
Earl N. Bridgman, Jr.	Jr.
George C. Broome, Jr.	Richard J. McManus
Lawrence E. Bryan	Samuel Meyer
James M. Catterson, Jr.	John C. Meyers
	Russell J. Mittelstadt
Herbert J. Cooke	Glenn Petrenko
Francis W. Cotten	Galyn D. Pownell
Elton J. Delaune, Jr.	Laurence H. Reece,
Eddie C. Dixon	Jr.
William J. Dunlap, O1914881	John J. Repko, Jr.
	Victor M. Robertson,
Edward R. Dyer, Jr., O1872775	Jr.
	John J. Sandhaas, Jr.
Eugene W. Ennis	Edmond P.
Arlen L. Fowler	Schexnayder
Donald J. Funk	Wilbur D. Stites,
Robert M. Garrison, O1874386	O2104252
	Albert G. Stefanik
Robert C. Gaskill	Joseph M. Stevenson
Merle R. Greene	Clarence E. Stiefel,
Jeremiah B. Hawkins	O2003117
Ross F. Hawkins, Jr.	Randol C. Tucker
John R. Hennigan, O1914636	Frank D. Turner, Jr.
	Fred H. Walton, Jr.
Carl L. Hooper, Jr.	Harold T. Webb
Jack P. Huddle	Medicus S. Williams,
William E. Jenkins	Jr.
Charles P. Jones	Thomas R. York
Jack J. Jumper	Joseph E. Zaice
Richard L. Laybourne	Alfred W. Zielonka

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Joseph G. McGlade
Gerald A. Ramthun

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States effective August 7, 1952, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Lee P. Moore, O1182197.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Edward L. Cochrane, United States Navy retired, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the term expiring June 30, 1956. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of June 21), 1952:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Phelps Phelps, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

Angus Ward, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS

To be consul general of the United States of America

Julian F. Harrington

To be consuls of the United States of America

William J. Barnsdale
Eugene V. Prostov

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1952

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty and ever-blessed God, who hast revealed Thyself as the Supreme Intelligence, we pray that we may begin, continue, and end each new day with a greater confidence in Thy wise and beneficent purposes.

May all who represent our beloved country in the affairs of government be guided in some special way by the eternal truth and wisdom and righteouness of God.

Give us the glad assurance that where Thou dost guide Thou wilt also provide. To Thy name we shall ascribe all the praise and glory, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7176. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 19[illegible], and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CORDON, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 206) entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1537. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II"; and

S. 2198. An act relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens," with an amendment as follows: On page 14, strike out line 18.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 418. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7231. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6854) entitled "An act 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, 1953, and for other purposes."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 25, 1952, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1739. An act to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy;

H. R. 5990. An act to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; and

H. R. 7340. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT BETTENDORF, IOWA

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8194) to amend an act approved May 26, 1928,

relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this comes to the floor with the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act approved May 26, 1928, is hereby amended by adding at the end of the section the following: "Any State or public agency or political subdivision thereof that may have originally constructed said bridge as assignee of the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act, and any State or public agency or political subdivision thereof that may have succeeded to the rights of such assignee and that may have taken over or acquired said bridge, is hereby authorized, and subject to approval of the pertinent plans by the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army, to enlarge and reconstruct said bridge and approaches, including the construction of a separate but adjacent span across the Mississippi River and approaches thereto with interconnections with the original span, and to continue to charge tolls for transit over such bridge as so enlarged and reconstructed, subject to the limitations expressed in section 3 hereof, to provide a fund sufficient to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches as so enlarged and reconstructed under economical management and to provide a sinking fund to amortize the cost thereof including interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the date of completion of such improvements, and after a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge and adjacent span shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls in accordance with such arrangement as may be mutually agreed upon by the public agency or political subdivision then owning said bridge and the State highway departments or other appropriate authorities of Iowa and Illinois, and, in connection with any such enlargement and reconstruction of said bridge and approaches thereto, shall have the right and power to enter upon and acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such real estate and other property as may be needed upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and the proceedings for such condemnation shall be the same as in the condemnation of private property for public purposes in such State."

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 5 of the act approved May 26, 1928, is hereby amended by striking out all of said sentence after the words "operated free of tolls" and inserting in lieu thereof "in accordance with such arrangement as may be mutually agreed upon by the public agency or political subdivision then owning said bridge and the State Highway Departments or other appropriate authorities of Iowa and Illinois."

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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.

GRANTING TO KAISER STEEL CORP. CERTAIN RIGHTS OF WAY

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1853) to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent-in-fee to certain other public lands, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 to 11, inclusive, and insert "That such rights-of-way be subject to existing rights in conflict therewith and shall be subject to reversion to the United States if the rights-of-way are abandoned or not used for a continuous period of 7 years by said corporation or its successors in interest: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Interior shall attach and impose such further conditions on said rights-of-way, and promulgate such rules and regulations as he shall deem appropriate, consistent with the use of said rights-of-way for the purposes prescribed in this act."

Page 3, line 25, after "less", insert ": *Provided,* That such patent shall be subject to a reservation to the United States of all deposits of minerals together with the right of the United States, its agents, permittees, lessees, or assigns to enter upon, prospect for, mine, and remove such minerals under the laws of the United States and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further,* That said property shall revert in fee to the United States in the event that said property is not used for a continuous period of 7 years as a camp site or mill site or for other incidental purposes in connection with the mining operations of said corporation or its successors in interest."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what are these Senate amendments?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate added some additional reservations which grant certain rights-of-way to the Kaiser Steel Corp. These amendments have been cleared with the author of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Who is the author?

Mr. ENGLE. The author of the bill is the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. The amendments have been take up with the minority side of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I heard the amendments read, they were more restrictive than the original bill?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is no opposition on the part of either the Republican or Democratic side?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from California if these rights are permanent rights inuring to the Kaiser Steel Corp. or are they only temporary rights?

Mr. ENGLE. They are temporary rights that can become permanent by a certain period of time, and the Senate put in the reservation which includes mineral rights.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 3268 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5734) to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3268 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to tax on bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The tax imposed under this section shall not apply for any period beginning after June 30, 1952, with respect to any bowling alley, billiard table, or pool table maintained exclusively for the use of members of the Armed Forces on any property owned, reserved, or used by, or otherwise acquired for the use of, the United States if no charge is made for their use."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after "(a)", insert "of the Internal Revenue Code."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill would exempt from the $20 a year occupational tax bowling alleys and billiard or pool tables where they are used exclusively by members of the Armed Forces on United States property and there is no charge for their use.

In the usual case, these alleys and tables are operated from profits derived from ships' service stores and post exchanges. Profits from these stores and exchanges are devoted to recreational programs for members of the Armed Forces, and the occupational taxes reduce funds available for these purposes.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

AMENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO DISTILLED SPIRITS AND ALCOHOL

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6366) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the

receipt in bond and tax payment at rectifying plants of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines for rectification, bottling, and packaging, or for bottling and packaging without rectification, and the production in bond and tax payment of gin and vodka at rectifying plants.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the bill?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, this bill would enable rectifying plants to receive and store in bond distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines pending tax payment, and remove it for rectification and bottling, or for bottling without rectification, and to produce gin and vodka in bond.

At the present time rectifiers must pay taxes on these items before they receive them. Since rectifiers must keep on hand a sufficient supply of spirits, alcohol, and wines to carry on their operations, they have large amounts of capital tied up in taxes. Most large rectifiers are also distillers and operate liquor warehouses which are situated near their rectifying plant. Thus, they suffer no great disadvantage in complying with the requirement that all liquors brought to their rectifying plant must be tax-paid. However, those rectifiers who are not situated near the places of storage and tax payment must invest considerable capital in liquors which must be tax-paid and then shipped to them. This means that small rectifiers with limited capital and rectifiers located at some distance from bonded warehouses are working under a competitive disadvantage. This bill would alleviate this disadvantage by permitting rectifiers to establish in-bond departments, in which untax-paid liquors may be stored. To insure that only the amount of spirits, alcohol, and wines are kept on hand which are necessary to carry on operations, the bill provides that the tax must be paid on these products at the time of their withdrawal or within 1 year from their deposit in the in-bond department.

The bill also authorizes the use of untax-paid neutral spirits or alcohol produced at a proof of 190° or more in the production of gin or vodka in a separate part of the in-bond department, which would be designated as the "special process room." Distillers at the present time are permitted to use untax-paid spirits of their own production in manufacturing gin and vodka. This bill would provide equal treatment for rectifiers, and also, due to the loss of spirits which normally occurs in the manufacturing of gin and vodka, would relieve rectifiers from having to pay taxes on spirits which are lost.

The Treasury Department advised the Committee on Ways and Means that it had no objection to the enactment of this bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subchapter A of chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by changing the designation of part IV to part V, and by inserting a new part IV as follows:

"PART IV—IN-BOND DEPARTMENT OF RECTIFYING PLANTS

"SEC. 2896. Withdrawal of spirits, alcohol, and wines in bond.

"(a) General: The Secretary may in his discretion, upon a showing of necessity, and upon the execution and filing of notices and bonds, authorize any qualified rectifier as defined in section 3254 (g) to withdraw and transfer in bond distilled spirits from any registered distillery, including fruit distillery (such registered distillery and registered fruit distillery being hereinafter referred to as "distillery") or internal revenue bonded warehouse, alcohol from any industrial alcohol plant or bonded warehouse, and wines from any bonded winery or bonded wine storeroom, to a separate portion of his rectifying plant (hereinafter referred to as the in-bond department) which shall be set apart and, except as provided in section 2897, used exclusively for the receipt and storage of such distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines pending tax payment and removal for rectification and bottling and packaging subsequent to rectification or for bottling and packaging without rectification.

"(b) Security of premises: The in-bond department shall be securely constructed and shall be separated from other portions of the rectifying plant or contiguous premises as regulations shall prescribe. Permanent storage tanks not located within a room or building, such as are authorized at bonded warehouses, may in the discretion of the Secretary be approved as a part of the in-bond department.

"(c) Control: The in-bond department of a rectifying plant shall be under the control of the District Supervisor of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division district in which the rectifying plant is located, and shall be in the joint custody of the storekeeper-gauger and the proprietor thereof, and shall be kept securely locked and shall at no time be unlocked or open or remain open except in the presence of such storekeeper-gauger or other person who may be designated to act for him. The keys to all Government locks shall remain at all times in the custody of such storekeeper-gauger or in the custody of the district supervisor or such other person as may be designated by the district supervisor.

"(d) Transfers to in-bond department: Distilled spirits may be transferred from any distillery or internal revenue bonded warehouse, alcohol may be transferred from any industrial alcohol plant or bonded warehouse, and wines may be transferred from any bonded winery or bonded wine storeroom to the in-bond department of a rectifying plant in approved containers and pipelines, as regulations may provide. The quantity of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines transferred to the in-bond department of a rectifying plant when added to the quantity of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines on deposit in such in-bond department shall not be in excess of that required to meet the needs, for not more than 1 year, of such plant or of one or more additional plants operated by a subsidiary or affiliate on contiguous premises.

"(e) Payment of taxes:

"(1) Basic taxes: The taxes imposed by sections 2800 (a) (1) and 3030 (a) shall, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2), be paid by the rectifier at the time of withdrawal of the distilled spirits, alcohol, or wines from the "in-bond department" of the rectifying plant in which they were deposited.

"(2) Time limitation: The tax imposed on distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines deposited in the in-bond department of a rectifying plant shall be due and payable 1 year from the date of deposit therein unless earlier withdrawn: *Provided*, That in no event shall the total period of storage of distilled spirits in a bonded warehouse and in the in-bond department of a rectifying plant be in excess of the 8-year period prescribed by section 2879 (b).

"(f) Bond: Every rectifier intending to provide an in-bond department for the receipt and storage of untax-paid distilled spirits, alcohol, or wines for the purposes authorized by this section, or for the receipt, storage, and use of untax-paid alcohol for the purposes authorized by section 2897, shall, upon filing with the Commissioner his notice of such intention, and before withdrawing any untax-paid distilled spirits, alcohol, or wines from any place of manufacture or storage, execute a bond in the form prescribed by regulations, conditioned that he shall faithfully comply with all provisions of law relating to the duties and business of a rectifier, and shall pay all taxes and penalties for which he may become liable. The said bond shall be in a penal sum not less than the sum of: (1) the amount of the tax on distilled spirits (including gin and vodka), alcohol, and wines on deposit or on hand in the in-bond department of the rectifying plant and in transit thereto at any one time, plus (2) the amount of the tax on rectified products that the rectifier will be liable to pay in a period of 30 days: *Provided*, That the penal sum of such bond shall not exceed the sum of $200,000. The provisions of section 2815 (c), (d), and (e) shall so far as applicable apply to bonds required under this subsection.

"(g) Transfer of unused spirits, alcohol, and wines: Untax-paid distilled spirits (except gin and vodka subject to the tax imposed by section 2800 (a) (5)), alcohol, or wines on deposit in the in-bond department of a rectifying plant for which the rectifier has no use, upon discontinuance of the plant or other reason, may be transferred to an internal revenue bonded warehouse, an industrial alcohol bonded warehouse, or a bonded winery or bonded wine storeroom, respectively, as regulations may provide.

"SEC. 2897. Production in bond and tax payment of gin and vodka.

"(a) Authorization: Any duly qualified rectifier who has provided on his rectifying plant premises an in-bond department in accordance with section 2896 may, under regulations, use neutral spirits or alcohol produced at a proof of 190° or more in the production of gin or vodka in a separate portion of such department (hereinafter referred to as the special process room) which shall be set aside and used exclusively for the purpose. The special process room shall be separated from other portions of the in-bond department or other contiguous premises and shall be constructed and secured as regulations shall provide.

"(b) Manufacturing process: The manufacturing process employed in the production of gin or vodka in the special process room shall be such as that authorized at registered distilleries and by which the spirits or alcohol shall pass through continuous, closed stills, tanks, pipes, and vessels until the finished gin or vodka is deposited in locked receiving tanks located in such room.

"(c) Payment of taxes: The taxes by section 2800 (a) (1) and by section 2800 (a) (5), if any, shall be paid by the rectifier at the time of withdrawal of the gin or vodka from the receiving tank in the Special Process Room and such gin and vodka shall, upon tax payment, be immediately removed from the in-bond department.

"SEC. 2898. Loss allowances.

"The provisions of sections 2901, 3113, and 3039 shall, insofar as applicable, apply in respect of losses of untax-paid distilled spir-

its (including gin and vodka), alcohol, and wines, respectively, occurring in the in-bond department of a rectifying plant or in transit thereto or therefrom.

"SEC. 2899. Regulations.

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part."

EXTENSION OF OTHER PROVISIONS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2913 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting "or in-bond department of a rectifying plant" following the world "warehouse" wherever it appears in such section.

(b) Section 2914 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting "or in-bond department of a rectifying plant" before the comma following the word "warehouse."

(c) Section 3107 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting before the period a comma and the following: "or to the in-bond department of a rectifying plant for beverage purposes only."

EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as restricting or limiting other provisions of the internal revenue laws.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 8, after line 7, insert the following:

"(d) Section 2878 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out 'Except as provided in section 2883' at the beginning of the section and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except as otherwise provided by law.'"

Page 8, line 11, insert the following new sentence: "The provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 shall be applicable to all functions vested by this act in any officer, employee, or agency of the Department of the Treasury."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BYRNES. Has unanimous consent been granted for the consideration of this bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES. I know there is considerable opposition to certain elements in it.

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.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 20 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 111]

Aandahl	Evins	Prouty
Abernethy	Fenton	Reece, Tenn.
Addonizio	Fisher	Richards
Albert	Frazier	Sabath
Allen, La.	Gore	Sasscer
Anderson, Calif.	Havenner	Steed
Aspinall	Herlong	Stigler
Bates, Ky.	Kennedy	Stockman
Beckworth	Lyle	Sutton
Burdick	Mansfield	Tackett
Carlyle	Morris	Thompson, Tex.
Carnahan	Nelson	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Welch
Dawson	Pickett	Wickersham
Dempsey	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 8370, Rept. No. 2316) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the week.

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

There was no objection.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8210) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 8210, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday it was agreed that sections 111 through 114, ending at line 10 on page 11 of the bill, be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to be offered at this time?

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

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the committee adopted, tentatively at least, the Cole amendment which provided for individual ceilings on price control. This amendment has a lot of things in it that I am sure the Members are not familiar with or I am sure they would not have adopted the amendment. In view of that, the chairman of the committee requested Governor Arnall, for whom I am sure the House has a high regard, to comment on what that would mean in regard to enforcement of price ceilings, and I should like to read what Governor Arnall has to say about it. He said this:

It is my considered judgment that an amendment of this kind——

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have not gone into this too thoroughly, but I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that it is against the rules of the House, which control the rules of the committee, to read letters from other than Members of Congress. We have been propagandized enough on this bill already.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Michigan objects to the reading of the letter, the question will then be put to the members of the Committee of the Whole for a decision. Does the gentleman object to the further reading of the letter?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; at this time I do object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the gentleman from California be permitted to proceed with the reading of the letter?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 103, noes 102.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. BOLLING.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 141, noes 113.

So Mr. McKINNON was permitted to proceed with the reading of the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the membership. I am sure there are many Members who are very desirous of getting all the information they can.

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

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I suggest the gentleman read the entire letter.

Mr. McKINNON. The letter reads as follows:

It is my considered judgment that an amendment of this kind, if adopted, would throw a costly monkey-wrench into the food price-control machinery. It would come close to making it completely unworkable. Its effects can be simply stated:

For the consumer it would mean higher food prices. For small food retailers it

would mean real hardship. And enforcement of food price ceilings would become impossible.

More about each of these points in a moment. But first let me emphasize my belief that it is absolutely essential for the House to follow the lead of your committee and reject any attempt to put the Herlong amendment on an individual mark-up basis.

Individual mark-ups would raise food prices. That is why some food organizations and particularly big chain grocers want to use them. They don't like uniform mark-ups for groceries, and they don't like dollars-and-cents ceilings on beef. They want individual mark-ups because that way they will get higher prices.

I don't need to tell you that food prices are too high right now. They are over 13 percent higher than they were before Korea and in the areas where we don't have controls they are going still higher, heading toward an all-time high. I just cannot believe that Congress will take any action which would raise food prices even more.

I want to give you just one illustration of what individual mark-ups might mean. Safeway Stores, Inc., is one of the food organizations principally interested in this amendment. This company has filed a protest claiming that our dollars-and-cents ceilings for beef are too low. They have asked for higher beef prices, saying that their mark-ups before Korea were higher than present ceilings allow.

We have looked at the proposed prices in the Safeway protest, and this is what we find would happen to retail beef prices if we gave Safeway the individual mark-ups it claims it is entitled to:

(a) Round steak would go up 10 cents a pound in Portland, and 12 cents a pound in Dallas.

(b) Ground beef would go up 3 cents a pound in Portland and in Dallas.

(c) Chuck roast would go up 10 cents a pound in Portland and 4 cents a pound in Dallas.

I have given figures for the cities for which Safeway has given us the information. You can bet your bottom dollar that you would have similar results in Chicago, Birmingham, Miami, Boston, and Detroit.

It may be argued that Safeway's mark-ups are lower than they claim. That may well be, but how are we going to check it? I don't believe Congress is going to give us an appropriation to quintuple our enforcement staff so we can find out whether the individual mark-ups, which hundreds of thousands of sellers are using are the ones they are entitled to.

What kind of control will we have over beef prices if every seller has his own ceiling, and if the consumer has no way of knowing what that ceiling ought to be? The enforcement problem alone is enough to show that food ceilings dependent on individual mark-ups are completely undesirable.

Who is pushing for individual mark-ups? The big grocery chains. We haven't heard any such demand from the small retailer. On the contrary, this amendment will hurt the small retailer.

Right now a small retailer finds his ceiling for a beef cut by looking at the dollars-and-cents table in our regulation. He finds his ceiling for a can of peas by adding to his invoice cost a fixed mark-up set out in our regulation. In order to get his ceiling he doesn't have to have any records except his current purchase invoices; he doesn't have to dig out old records and labor through a series of mathematical computations; and he doesn't have to file anything with OPS.

If this proposal goes through, he will have to go back to his old records—if he has them—and determine his individual mark-ups on between 1,000 and 3,000 items and file pricing charts with OPS.

Most small retailers, according to the testimony of their own representatives, just do not have such records. The few small retailers who do have the records will be justifiably angry at the work, the nuisance, and the red tape which this proposal means.

Individual mark-ups are all right for some distributive trades where prices are stable and where records are available. But even in such businesses, mark-ups must be based on some date near the time when the regulation is issued. You simply cannot get records on individual mark-ups for the period before Korea, as this proposal requires.

We recently had an experience showing how small-business men feel about ceilings based on individual mark-ups. A retail liquor regulation provided that liquor retailers should esablish their ceilings by adding individual mark-ups as shown by their records. We got so many complaints from liquor retailers about the amount of work that this required that we had to revise the regulation to put retail liquor dealers on a uniform mark-up basis.

In the retail grocery field, it is virtually out of the question to maintain effective price control on an individual mark-up basis. Prices fluctuate from day to day, and selling price records are not generally available.

On previous occasions, we have shown that present ceiling-price regulations are designed to give grocers their traditional mark-ups. The margins now permitted them were fixed on the basis of the best information available as to pre-Korea practices. And we are about to complete a survey to determine whether adjustments—either upward or downward—are in order.

Approval of the individual mark-up provision is, therefore, neither necessary nor desirable. It would only lead to high prices for chain groceries and needless red tape for small retailers.

On top of the unnecessary labor with which businessmen would be saddled, there would be confusion twice confounded. OPS does not have the staff to check the individual filings required by this proposal. Nor could it possibly have enough enforcement people to check on compliance.

I am confident that if Congress is informed of the consequences of this high-food price, red-tape amendment, it will be overwhelmingly defeated. This is no time to raise the prices of food to housewives or to make the small-business man go through mountains of red tape just to satisfy a few food organizations.

I hope that you will call these considerations to the attention of the House if the individual mark-up amendment is offered on the floor.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS ARNALL.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the House decided by a teller vote to permit the reading of this letter. I submit that the letter should be read in its entirety; that is the point of order I make.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not the decision made by the Committee. The Committee made the decision that the gentleman could read the letter within the time allotted to the gentleman of 5 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I did not hear it so stated when the motion was put, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question put to the Committee had nothing whatsoever to do with the time to be consumed by the gentleman from California. The Chair recognized the gentleman from California for 5 minutes; the question arose as to whether or not he could within that 5 minutes time read extraneous papers.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, when I objected to the reading of the letter I did not know what it contained. I had no idea what was in the letter; I merely thought that this Committee of the Whole should protest as strongly against lobbying on bills by administrative agencies as by any other segment of our economy.

It would be lamentable—now that Safeway is mentioned I shall mention Safeway—it would be lamentable if Safeway Stores were to be given 5 minutes on this floor to tell you why there should be these individual mark-ups; that is what we have legislative committees for.

Mr. Arnall appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and if he proved anything to the committee it was that Mr. Arnall in his position as Administrator of OPS is merely a public relations man and is not administering OPS.

I wish that the watchdog committee which we set up under this bill 2 years ago would ask Mr. Arnall how many hours he has spent at his desk in the last 2 months.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I cannot.

Mr. O'TOOLE. How many has he spent?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Ask the press.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I am asking you.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They will tell you; they told me. The watchdog committee is set up for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, this is an all-time job, this stabilizing of the economy of the United States, if it is to be done through direct controls. Mr. Arnall, as well as Mr. Putnam, showed a lamentable lack of information in respect to fundamental economics; not as much as you would expect the corner grocerman to have in respect to his business.

I attended a forum down at the Statler Hotel in which Mr. Arnall and Mr. Putnam spoke. Mr. Arnall convinced all of us that he was so lost in a labyrinth of red tape in his own office he did not know what he was doing. There were five-hundred-and-some-odd divisions, the heads of which he did not know, he could not recall their names and did not know them when they walked into his office. But you cannot get acquainted with the heads of all these divisions by making speeches all over the United States, and this letter that was read today is evidence of the fact he is in there not doing his job necessarily as Administrator but is more interested in lobby-

ing for continuance of controls than he is in the application of these controls under the direction of the Congress. That is why I object to that letter. Under the circumstances, with the man's lack of knowledge of the fundamentals of economics, in view of the fact he is at his desk so seldom, I did not think he should have the right to assume this Congress would give too much credence to his views on pending questions.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this House for quite a long time and this is the first time I have ever seen a point of order made objecting to the reading of a letter that was pertinent to the consideration of a bill. I never expected it and least of all from the very able senior minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but with all his faults I have a deep affection for him.

The gentleman did not attack the letter; he attacked the Administrator, Governor Arnall. Well, I consider that just a Republican statement about a Democratic official. Mr. Arnall gave some very good reasons why you should not adopt the Cole amendment. The gentleman who just made the statement in reference to that did not say a word about the letter, but made an attack upon the Administrator.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words as to what is going to happen if the House adopts the Barden amendment. The greatest purchaser in the United States or in the world of goods and services is the Government of the United States. In 8 months after Korea you appropriated $35,000,000,000 for defense, but because of inflation that shrunk in purchasing power to $28,000,000,000. We are appropriating $3,500,000,000 a month for defense. Before long it will go to $4,500,000,000, I am informed, and next year there will be appropriated $60,000,000,000. What will be the result of taking the price ceilings off of the strategic and critical materials that this Government has to purchase? There will be a spiraling rise and there will be supplemental appropriation after supplemental appropriation to make up the difference. The Government will lose billions of dollars if price ceilings are taken off, and the Government has no way to protect itself any more than the individual consumer. Because of that rise and because of the lack of purchasing power of our money there will be an increase in taxation for we have to get the materials.

When you vote on the Barden amendment I want you to think of that. Do you want to cripple the defense effort? Many people think we ought not to be making any defense effort; that we ought not to look to the future; that we ought to stick our heads in the sand as the ostrich does; see nothing, hear nothing, and know nothing.

I believe it would be a tragic mistake to take these ceilings off at this time and subject the Government to the will of the producers in the things it needs. There is no law on the statute books that will protect the Government; it has no means of protecting itself except by the action of this Congress. I want you to consider that when you come to vote on the Barden amendment, which I hope will be shortly.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that we cannot finally adopt an amendment in this Committee without having the Members once again attempt to bring it back upon the floor and discuss it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to this letter written on June 18 by Mr. Arnall to the chairman of our committee. The letter was written long before the House started consideration of the amendment which I offered. That is No. 1.

No. 2. The letter, in my judgment, is a flamboyant effort to deceive, to prejudice, to mislead, not only the membership of this body, but the people of the Nation. I want to show why and talk about the letter itself. Mr. Arnall says, "It is my understanding that some large food organizations are urging that the Herlong amendment be changed."

No. 3. Mr. Arnall knows and every person in the OPS knows as well as every person on the Committee on Banking and Currency knows that it is not just the large food organizations which are insisting upon this change. It is every retailer in this country. Every retailer, large and small, retailers who are in chain organizations, retailers who are independent, every single one of them have asked that this amendment be adopted by the House. And, why?

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the grocery business.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. In the grocery business as well as other retailers. Why? Because every other retailer and wholesaler in the country has the relief which the grocers have asked for in the Herlong amendment and in the Cole amendment. The other businesses believe in fairness and justice. Mr. Arnall says that for small retailers it would mean a real hardship. The small retailers have asked for the Cole amendment and are continuing to ask for it. Why? Because the other retailers of the country have the right to have a historical, individual mark-up. All should be in the same class.

Mr. Arnall further says:

> Who is pushing for individual mark-ups? The big grocery chains. We haven't heard any such demand from the small retailer.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this as strongly as I can: That is an untruth and Governor Arnall knows it is an untruth.

The Governor further said:

> If this proposal goes through, he will have to go back to his old records.
>
> Right now a small retailer finds his ceiling for a beef cut by looking at the dollars-and-cents table in our regulation.

Who fixes the price of groceries today? It is the supermarkets, the large grocery stores, of course, and the chains. Those prices are fixed by competition. Hundreds of items are selling under ceiling prices today. They are fixed by the large grocers, of course. Why? Because they have the opportunity to buy in greater amounts. The small grocery must meet those prices in order to stay in business. All the small grocer asks for is that he be permitted to have his individual historical mark-up in order that he may have the same type of profit that he had prior to Korea. Is not that fair? Is there anything unjust about it? He merely wants to be treated the same as other retailers.

I ask this question: If individual mark-ups are fair and proper for all other wholesalers and retailers, why are they not fair for this one group? This question has not, and will not be answered by Mr. Arnall or anyone opposing my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, never before in the history of the world has one nation carried the same measure of responsibility for the whole future of mankind that the United States carries today.

At a time when the threat to civilization comes from a highly organized and powerful ideological force, whose world plan is to divide man from man, class from class, nation from nation, the existing situation in the steel industry is a serious reflection of the weakness of this country in face of such strategy.

It has not been easy for me to reach the conclusion that I will support the amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950 to request the President to use the provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. I do so however because of a fundamental belief in the democratic procedure of legislation. The law of the land, passed by Congress by a majority vote, must be given every opportunity to function. To suggest that the law should not be invoked because it may not be obeyed is to undermine the confidence of the Nation in the effectiveness and the whole process of the legislature.

This decision is made on a basis of what I believe to be right and not on a basis of expediency. It is made too in the interest of upholding the decision of Congress and with no thought for the possible loss of the votes of labor supporters who like myself have come honestly to feel that certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have become divisive and will continue to drive a wedge between labor and management.

Mr. Chairman, a standard has been set for our action in this House by our late respective colleague, James N. Wadsworth, at whose funeral it was said that he was a man "shorn of cheap expediency."

I am reminded of his prophetic words in 1943 when he addressed a Philadelphia audience after a showing of the Forgotten Factor. These are his words:

> The crisis, so far as our institutions in this country are concerned, will not end with victory on the field of battle. New difficulties will confront us—complications extraordinary; and if we do not work together with each other, but work apart, distrusting each other, we may tear down everything that we hold sacred in this country after we have defeated our country's enemies.
>
> The crisis is not tapering off. The going will be tougher before it is easier. It is

going to strain all our strength and demand all our spirit. We shall do the task so infinitely better if we do it together, hand in hand, trusting one another, having faith in one another.

At times it seems to me if our Nation is to endure, we must be resolute in sacrificing our selfishness for our country. Otherwise, we will sacrifice our country for our selfishness.

The issues at stake today go far beyond the immediate one, whether Congress should suggest to the President alternative methods of approach to the deadlock in the steel industry, with its causing suffering to all those involved and serious curtailment to the defense program.

The main issue is the challenge to us—the elected representatives of the people—to create the atmosphere in which men of divergent points of view can find unity in the highest interests of the Nation. That is the answer to the deadlock in steel. That is the answer for this Nation in a time of crisis.

The provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act may be invoked; the economic and social systems of the country may be changed; the terms of contracts, wage agreements, and methods of collective bargaining can be altered; but without a new spirit no contribution will have been made toward bridging the chasms of bitterness and mistrust which divide and weaken this Nation. In a recent airline strike here in America, one of the contestants stated, "Bitterness gets so high no reasonable problem can be discussed."

If America is to fulfill its destiny as the defender of freedom and democracy, industry—labor and management together—must assume a new commitment to lay the foundations of unity in the Nation. This can only be born out of a fundamental change of heart on both sides.

Right across the world today thousands of ordinary men, leaders of labor and management alike, are finding a new factor which can be applied immediately, however difficult economic or national conditions may be, which creates unity of hearts and minds. This is no theory. From personal experience I know of the mass of evidence demonstrating the efficacy of this simple yet forgotten factor.

Negotiations opened by honest apology from both sides and continued with an adherence to the principles of absolute honesty, absolute unselfishness, and the simple idea of what is right instead of who is right, by men who have decided to seek the guidance of God in their lives, are producing a new industrial relationship and the answer to division.

Recently in this country there have been many remarkable instances. A labor leader, with statesmanlike qualities, solved the difficulties in his own company. Then with a new-found sense of responsibility and a conception of the true function of industry, was instrumental in bringing an answer to another industry. When asked to address a group of leading American industrialists, he said:

It is the function of labor to anticipate the needs of management in the best interests of the Nation, and so it is for management to meet the needs of labor. I still fight for the interests of labor, but decisions reached on the basis of what is right mean a fuller and more satisfying life for labor and management. An industrialist recently talked "of the steely selfishness of management which produced the bitterness of labor," and went on to say: "All my experience convinces me that without widespread trust and confidence we face industrial chaos. We cannot trust unless we become trustworthy, and that demands change and acceptance of moral standards."

I am reminded of a great American, a world statesman, who has said:

Human nature can be changed, that is the root of the answer. National economies can be changed, that is the fruit of the answer. World history can be changed, that is the destiny of our age.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, if the President sees fit to invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in this emergency, we shall have a so-called cooling-off period of 80 days. These days are a time of grace giving both sides an opportunity to apply the new factors here discussed. In my judgment only on the assumption that these factors will be given trial can our request of the President be justified.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that Governor Arnall is one of the best administrators in Government today. He is one of the few administrators I have found who is aware of the fact that many of the bureaucrats in the various departments are very contemptuous of the people and the rights of the people, and especially so of their elected representatives to whom the people come when they have problems with those departments. I think I would be remiss if I did not say that Governor Arnall, when I have called on him with a problem from a constituent, has been very alert to solve that problem and find an answer for it. I have never called down there when I have not found him at his desk. But I would like to say this: Any administrator must do some public-relations work by the very nature of the job he has. I might say to my good friend the gentleman from Michigan that I visited the office of another administrator last November in Paris—an administrator by the name of Eisenhower. I found that his office was crowded with employees and policymakers whose names he did not know, and I found that he was frequently away from his desk on public-relations missions, not only in the immediate vicinity of his office but all over the world. Of course, then, he was busy, too, on another mission plotting in a not so public way with certain sections of the Republican Party. I might say to my good friend the gentleman from Michigan, he was busily engaged most of the time with the eastern internationalist wing of that party to steal the nomination from the very Republicans who have carried the banner of the Republican Party through 20 lean years. I might say further that, in my opinion, the mumbo-jumbo artists who are managing Mr. Eisenhower's campaign care nothing for him or his principles. They merely want to use his name, if possible, as a springboard to power. Does anyone think that the Eisenhower bureaucrats are superior to bureaucrats in general?

Specifically, on this amendment—the Cole amendment—I am interested in the small retailer. I am interested in decontrol as soon as it is practicable and possible to decontrol. But I have served on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have not had one letter from one small retailer—not the first letter—in support of the Cole amendment because, as was pointed out here, there is no small retailer who has the records and the bookkeeping facilities to find out what his markup would be if the Cole amendment is adopted.

Any small retailer who has any knowledge of price-control law will tell you how it is far more simple and more expedient and that he would rather have a dollar-and-cents mark-up so that he would know exactly where he stands.

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKINNON. Is it not true that in the rather lengthy hearings which our committee held, no representative of a small-business group appeared before our committee and asked for the Cole amendment? We had in our committee two statements; one from a Mr. Bauer, head of the Retail Meat Dealers' Association, and a Mr. Draft, of the National Association of Retail Grocers, who both made statements to the committee, but neither asked for the Cole amendment nor desired the Cole amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I think that is essentially the fact. I think that this is essentially a chain store amendment. They are the people who will profit by this amendment.

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The committee heard from the retailers in the distribution of milk, did they not?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is true.

Mr. NICHOLSON. And Mr. Arnall heard from them, too, did he not, and he will not give them their mark-up.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman in that feature, but that has nothing to do with this retail food business.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It is a part of the mark-up in the price of the commodity, whatever business the man may be in.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I think there is a big problem in the mark-up on milk, but I do not think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] believes for a minute that the Cole amendment will give any relief in that situation. I think there is a real problem there which the small milk dealer has against the big chain dealers, but this amendment will not give any relief to him.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. In reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON] I would say that both of those organizations represent small retailers and

both of them in their statements support the theory on which the Cole amendment was adopted. That is the individual, historical mark-up.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman I have talked to some small retailers about this, and they tell me they do not have the facilities to determine the mark-up under the Cole amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the House should be aware of this particular fact in reference to the letter that the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON] read to us a few minutes ago. The gentleman read it to the House, and as I understood it, and probably as many of you understood it, as if it were an expression of the Director of OPS written to the chairman of the committee yesterday on some action which the House had taken on the bill before us yesterday. That is not true.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. In just a moment. After I have made my statement I will yield.

The fact of the matter is that the letter was written on June 18 by the Director of OPS to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in anticipation of some action that the committee or the House might take on this bill, that would give the right to individual retailers for their historic mark-ups. In reading the letter I find that Mr. Arnall is trying to give retailers some relief from the red tape that is required by his office by saying that the individual mark-up would burden the retailer with a lot of bookkeeping and a lot of detail that he would not have to go through if the individual mark-up was not guaranteed.

Now, that is very considerate of Mr. Arnall, but it does not give the retailer the right to add to his cost of his products a fair addition that he should in order to establish the price. Regardless of that, let me say that if the Cole amendment were adopted and if the Herlong amendment were adopted, and even if this bill is made more stringent than it is now, regardless of all this action, the public is going to determine the price of food by supply and demand, whether price control is in effect or not.

It is that way now; you can buy almost any commodity if you search the market enough at below the ceiling set by OPS. So you have the over-all imposition of responsibility on the retailer and wholesaler to keep a lot of books and go through a lot of red tape to keep a Federal bureau operating with some 16,000 employees at a cost to the taxpayers of something like $100,000,000.

In relation to the individual mark-up, I received from my district in southern California a complaint of the last increase in ceilings that was approved by OPS on certain food products. They said it was strictly propaganda for the reason that every item on which ceilings were increased were selling from 2 to 5 cents below OPS ceilings at the time; there was no reason to increase the ceiling; they did not want it; they could not raise their prices to the ceilings, for the public would not pay them. The public would not pay them because the goods were in ample supply. So I think the House should realize that this letter is not one that was writen last night because of some action we took in the House yesterday.

The Cole amendment is not going to change the fundamental law of supply and demand, and the public is going to determine how much the retailer can add to the cost of his product. He has got to put a price on it at which it will sell. So we should cease laboring under the impression that OPS is doing a favor to retailers and wholesalers by saying that they do not have to do all this bookkeeping.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is a fact, is it not, that basic commodity prices all over the world have broken substantially in the last few weeks?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is a fact that people have been trying to unload their inventories all over this country, this stuff that is in these retail stores, and we find that there is a breaking market. Everyone knows what happens when there is this inventory unloading; you cannot keep the price up by regulation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The demand will determine the price insofar as the public is concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how many amendments are at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised there are seven amendments at the Clerk's desk at this time.

Mr. SPENCE. I ask that the amendments be considered; I ask that the Clerk read the first amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The mere fact that an amendment is at the Clerk's desk does not mean that it is pending; somebody has to offer an amendment before it can be considered.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this title of the bill and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, are there amendments pending to the section upon which debate has just been closed?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that there are three amendments pending that have not been offered by Members.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to this title and I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute to speak on it.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the action the Committee just took closed debate on this section?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct, but the gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the next section and I desire recognition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we are not going to debate these amendments. I object.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment agreed to by the committee. May it be read?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York offer an amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 11, after line 10, insert the following new section:

"Subsection (B) of section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs and of the fairness to consumers of the prices authorized by this act and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration thereof.' "

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, may I propound a unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to discuss this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes only to add to the duties of the Joint Committee on Defense Production under section 712 of the existing law, also known as the watchdog committee, the additional duty of study "of the fairness to consumers of the prices authorized by this act." This duty being in addition to the duty of the committee as presently authorized to study and review the program under the act. The bill is essentially one to protect consumers against inflation.

Everyone is a consumer but in addition there are millions of pure consumers in our country among the adult population. For example, there are 4,500,000 social-security annuitants, 6,000,000 Government workers and approximately 2,500,000 receiving veterans compensations and pensions in the shape of disability and death benefits. In addition, there are millions of widows, orphans and retired persons living on fixed incomes. To this number may be added the almost 25,000,000 who are known as white collar workers and whose salaries traditionally lag behind living costs. Under my amendment the watchdog committee would study the impact upon them of the prices allowed under the Defense Production Act.

I believe that this amendment is especially necessary in view of the evident temper of the House and Senate for

widespread decontrol of prices while leaving the machinery for price and wage stabilization. This has not been accomplished in the bill now before the House but probably will be before it becomes law in view of the general temper of both Houses. My amendment takes on an added significance and importance under these circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 61, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHELLEY: On page 9, line 24, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 112. Section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'No rule, regulation, order, or policy issued under this act shall direct that preference be given to the placement of procurement in geographic areas designated as areas of current or imminent labor surplus, unless such rule, regulation, order, or policy specifies that in each individual procurement to be so placed a study shall be made of the skilled labor supply and the production facilities available in the industry involved and in the geographic area which would be deprived of the procurement contract through such preference, and that if such study shows that skilled labor and adequate production facilities are available in that geographic area for the production of the item or items to be acquired by the Federal Government through the subject procurement preference shall not be given any other area. Any such rule, regulation, order, or policy heretofore issued is hereby rescinded'."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY]. It is not germane. The amendment seeks to amend the general statute. It does not amend a particular item of the bill. It is not germane to the sections either preceding or succeeding or that portion of the bill against which it is aimed. It does not come within the four squares of the purpose of this legislation. It is a matter that is peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor. It is a new section to the bill. Even if it bore a direct relation to the bill—and made the question somewhat difficult of determination—certainly there is no question but that the amendment is offered in a wrong place. It should have been offered earlier. It comes too late. It cannot now be considered.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, the amendment is germane to the bill because section 704 of the Defense Production Act allows the President to make such rules and regulations and orders as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of the act. The amendment refers to that section of the bill referring to orders and regulations. It simply straightens out a situation that has existed which needs correction and which is causing great hardship in some areas of the country. A result has been obtained by the issuance of an Executive order, and it is my sense and my belief that the Congress has the right, and the proper right, when it is legislating, to legislate to make corrections of improprieties or of injustices which have occurred through the issuance of Executive orders which are issued in implementing the legislation originally enacted by the Congress. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the point of order does not apply and that the amendment should be considered on its merits.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] offers an amendment on page 9, line 24 of the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] makes the point of order against the amendment on the ground that the amendment is not germane.

The Chair has had an opportunity to read the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] and the Chair has also had an opportunity to reread section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to which the gentleman proposes his amendment.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is not germane at this point in the bill. Section 704 authorizes the President to make such rules and regulations and orders as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act. As the Chair understands the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, the gentleman is proposing a substantive change in the law, and the proposal would not be germane at this point in the bill.

Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret that my amendment modifying defense manpower policy No. 4 will not be brought before the House for a vote because of the Chair's ruling. When this issue was before us last Friday in voting on the amendments offered by the distinguished gentlemen from Pennsylvania and Georgia [Mr. POTTER and Mr. LANHAM] many of the Members of the House, including myself and others from the California delegation, were under a misapprehension as to the possible future effects of the policy on our own districts and on our States. If my amendment had come to a vote those Members would, I am sure, have appreciated the opportunity to pass on the matter again in the light of later evidence which has reached us.

Just before the House went into session last Friday, and knowing that manpower policy No. 4 would be an issue before the Committee that day, a group of California Members met with representatives of Government agencies administering the policy, in my office. In the discussion that morning strenuous attempts were made to convince those Members present that manpower policy No. 4 would, both in the long run and in the immediate future, have a beneficial effect on industry in California and in our own districts. We were told that within a very short time the major industrial areas in California would move into group 4 classifications as areas of labor surplus, and that when that happened we would be eligible for preference under policy No. 4 in placing Government contracts. We were also told that the New York area, the major surplus labor area now competitive with California industries which have suffered from the policy, particularly the shipbuilding and electronics industries, would soon be out of the group 4 classification and would no longer be able to take contracts from us.

On the basis of that supposedly authentic information we went to the floor and voted on whether policy No. 4 should be retained or eliminated. A check since made with the Bureau of Employment Security field offices in California discloses that there is small possibility that California industrial areas will move into a group 4 classification at any time in the near future. This report is completely at variance with the information we were given here by Bureau representatives. While I do not wish to make charges on the floor naming names, I do want to go on record as personally deeply resentful of what I consider to be a deliberate attempt on the part of certain of the agency representatives at last Friday's meeting to mislead the California representatives as to the true situation. No matter whether the attempt was made from misguided zeal to preserve the policy, or from ignorance, there can be no defense for that type of misrepresentation. I want here and now to condemn the action in the strongest terms.

Defense manpower policy No. 4 as it is now administered is a bungling effort. Its aim is to preserve labor skills and industrial facilities in areas suffering from lack of work due to dislocations produced by the defense emergency. What it now does is to shift contracts away from skilled labor and essential facilities into areas where there is an excess labor supply which may be composed of bartenders, beauticians, elevator operators and doormen. It creates distressed labor conditions within essential industries in new areas, while for the most part the only relief it brings is to areas where the unemployed labor is largely unskilled. Unless the formula I have proposed in the amendment just ruled out of order is put into effect, the policy will never help the defense effort. It is certainly hurting it now. It causes confusion, uncertainty, and resentment among essential producers in areas not certified under the policy to have an excess of labor. It causes disaster in one-industry towns when a big con-

tract is taken from them and shifted elsewhere. It takes sorely needed contracts from distressed industries struggling to keep their skilled labor working, as is the case with the shipbuilding industry on the west coast. The policy is, in short, a blundering attempt to cure a slight headache, which, in the process of cure brings acute and disabling attacks to the other vital parts of our industrial body.

Although the House has been deprived of the chance to direct a change in the policy, I call upon the Office of Defense Mobilization and the administration to bring about its elimination or drastic revision. The harmful effects of policy No. 4 are rapidly snowballing—in spite of our 98° weather. The number and value of contracts shifted as a result of preference under the policy is mounting daily. California has already lost millions of dollars in vital contracts and stands to lose millions more. The evidence that the policy has misfired cannot now be overlooked. It is high time for an overhaul—and the officials charged with the responsibility should see to it without delay.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEICHEL: On page 9, after line 16, add the following:

"SEC. 111 (b) Subsection (c) of section 109 of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951 which amends section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'and provides for extending natural gas for house heating to amputee veterans, other hardship cases, and totally disabled individuals'."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak for the committee, but personally I have no objection to the amendment, and I do not think the committee has.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, some people refuse to learn from experience. We all know what happened to prices when OPA came to an end.

Advocates of the suspension of price controls persist in the erroneous claim that you need no price controls when items are selling under ceiling and that the suspension of such price controls on such items will not affect the prices thereof.

The proof is directly to the contrary. On June 5, 1952, because of the terrific pressures and demands on OPS the price of potatoes was decontrolled. The prices immediately went up to well over the ceiling price. We were told that was only temporary and as soon as the black marketeers got rid of their potatoes the prices would drop. They were right.

The prices did drop for a day or two and then they climbed right on up again. Today, exactly 3 weeks after potato prices were decontrolled, potatoes are selling at $2 to $4 per cwt., more than they were selling for on June 5, 1952, the difference in prices varying in accordance with the kind of potatoes and the market in which they are being sold.

What happened to potatoes will happen to every commodity when you remove price control before the end of the emergency.

The attacks we heard today on Governor Arnall were entirely unwarranted. They remind me of the young lawyer who was warned by the experienced trial practitioner, that if he tried a case that was weak on the facts, to argue the law and if it was weak on the law, to argue the facts, and if it was weak on both the facts and the law, to attack his adversary. Having no better argument to offer in support of their position, the advocates of price decontrol now attack the administrator.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the question we are deciding here today is of the greatest importance to the people of the United States. It involves our economic well-being and our security.

If all danger of inflation had disappeared—if there were no possibility that the prices all of us must pay for our daily necessities would shoot up, I would be for removing all unnecessary burdens from our business community. But is the danger over? We have heard a great deal about commodities which are selling below their legal ceiling prices. But it is a fact that this past spring 50 percent of all the things that make up the Consumer Price Index—our best measurement of the cost of living—were still at their peak or very near it. Twenty-one percent of these commodities were only 2 percent below their all-time high levels. Less than 10 percent of these items were as much as 10 percent below their peaks. These are the results of a study made early this spring by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Since then, the cost-of-living index has advanced another 0.6 percent. It stands today only a fraction of a percent below its all-time high. Are these facts indications that there are no pressures pushing prices up?

Freight rates recently went up again. These rates have increased 16 percent since January 1951. This has forced OPS, in many cases, to grant price increases to compensate for greater transportation costs.

Since enactment of the Defense Production Act of 1951, thousands of industries have applied to OPS for higher ceilings based on the Capehart amendment formula. Do these industries want higher ceilings when they foresee the clear possibility of producing and selling at lower prices?

There is another aspect of this question which worries me even more than the possibility of increases in the cost of living.

It seems hardly necessary to recall that what we are considering today is part of the Defense Production Act. Price and wage controls have a very definite bearing on our ability to carry out our present defense production program. And we must be able to carry out this program. On that point there is no argument. No one would disagree to the proposition that we must be strong enough to resist aggression—that we must be able to negotiate only from a position of overwhelming strength.

The inflationary period we endured during the months immediately following the outbreak in Korea took two billion out of every ten billion the Congress appropriated for defense. Should another inflationary spiral of the same intensity develop this fall it would add more than nine billions to the cost of our security, at the present rate of spending. By October, the additional cost might be $12,000,000,000.

Another bout with inflation would seriously hinder our ability to finish up the job of building up our defenses.

To tinker with the machinery set up to prevent the reoccurrence of other inflationary periods seem to be foolhardy under present world conditions. The situation in Korea has not improved despite our fnfinite patience at the conference table. While we have been trying to bring about an armistice there, Communist forces have built up tremendously. Only yesterday our Secretary of Defense warned that Communist China's air fleet has more than 2,000 planes. Our top military and diplomatic leaders have warned us of the "evil pattern visible today both in the Far East and in the West."

Is it good statesmanship, is it wise to do anything that might weaken our economic health under these circumstances?

One of the main arguments advanced for removal of all price and wage control machinery at this time is that these temporary controls impose heavy burdens on our industrial and business communities. So they do. But this is a period of national emergency. In such periods, all of us must accept extra burdens.

Our present price stabilization machinery is geared to suspend ceilings on commodities that are selling below legal ceilings and which do not threaten to climb to those ceilings in the foreseeable future.

Such a system of selective relaxation of controls would remove all unnecessary burdens from our business and industrial communities whenever and wherever it is safe to do so. Is not this wiser than to destroy the entire machinery, built at the cost of many millions of dollars? Let us keep in mind that if we destroy this machinery, we may not have the opportunity to rebuild it in time, should inflation again threaten our defense program and our standards of living.

I do not doubt for a minute the sincerity and good intentions of those who sincerely believe controls are no longer needed. Neither do I doubt the patriotism and sincerity of those who think inflation is still the main threat to our economic strength. Being as impartial as one can be, it must be recognized that there is at least a serious difference of opinion on this point. While such difference lasts, is it wise to knock down the fences we have been building against this danger? Does a prudent businessman cancel his fire insurance just when some well-qualified people tell him that there is a fire smoldering in his plant?

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, June 25, 1952.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Thank you for calling to my attention today that some Member of the Congress has expressed the view that I have said that the emergency is no longer with us, and that price and wage controls are no longer needed. I am sure that any Member of the Congress who said this was honest in his impression of my views, but he was erroneously informed as to my views. I have never made any such statement, at any time, in any place. On the contrary, I believe that the emergency is still with us, and that price and wage controls are still needed.

This is a high matter of legislative policy, now being considered by the Congress, and each Member must exercise his own honest judgment. I am not writing you this letter to attempt to influence anybody. But since you inform me that my views have been referred to in the course of debate, I want to set the record straight on what they are.

In the January 1952 Annual Economic Review published by the Council of Economic Advisers and transmitted to the Congress, of which I was one of the signatories as chairman of the council, a strong argument for the continuation of price and wage controls is contained on pages 144–148. The argument for their continuance now is at least as strong as in January, because business conditions now are stronger than in January and the cost of living is now higher than in January.

In my printed testimony on January 23, 1952, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I strongly urged the continuation of price and wage controls.

Testifying in March 1952 before the Subcommittee on General Credit Control and Debt Management of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I stated on page 285 of the published hearings that we should "hold on to and keep in good working order the variety of anti-inflationary tools which are now in active use" and that "I think it would be most imprudent now to get rid of these tools."

In the course of the same hearings (p. 204) I placed price and wage stabilization importantly on the list of necessary anti-inflationary measures in these times.

The economic situation now is stronger than it was in March, defense outlays are higher and rising, unemployment is lower, and the Government deficit is rising. For all of these reasons, anyone who favored price and wage controls in March should certainly favor them now, and I do.

A couple of weeks ago, I submitted an article for publication in the New York Times, which has not yet been published, in which I indicate the necessity for maintaining the kind of economic controls that we now have.

In the current draft of the Midyear Review by the Council of Economic Advisers, which is being prepared for issuance in mid-July, the retention of price and wage controls is urged.

I have consistently advised the President, and the stabilization officials, as well as any Member of the Congress who may have asked for my advice, that it is much too early to get rid of price and wage controls.

In an oral presentation, which I made to the President's National Advisory Board on Mobilization Policy on June 16, I expressed my view to the assembled group of leaders of industry, agriculture, and labor that it is much too early to get rid of price and wage controls.

Consequently, it is clear that this is the position which I have constantly taken; and nobody can produce any statement that I have made anywhere taking a contrary position.

More generally, and in response to what you said to me on the telephone today, I certainly do not believe that the emergency is over. On the contrary, I have been saying all over the country that the emergency is still with us, and that no danger could be so great as the danger of our relaxing prematurely. In fact, that is the main theme of the New York Times article which I submitted a couple of weeks ago and which will appear shortly.

Let me repeat that I do not want to engage in dispute with any Member of the Congress or to intrude upon the legislative function. But in response to your specific inquiry of me today, I have felt bound to transmit to you my actual views with respect to price and wage controls at this time.

Very sincerely yours,
LEON H. KEYSERLING,
Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, June 26, 1952.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Since writing to you yesterday, I have had opportunity to read page 8067 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 25. On this page, there is quoted an excerpt from a news report in the New York Journal of Commerce of June 20, 1952, reporting upon an extemporaneous talk which I made on June 19 to a national group of business editors.

The excerpt quoted from the New York Journal of Commerce news account does not say that I am against the continuation of price and wage controls. It merely says that the expansion of production has been even more important than the controls in maintaining the economy on an even keel; this is true and I have always said it. My statement that there is no serious danger of inflationary pressures of a serious and over-all character over the next year, and that we can maintain price stability, is predicated upon maintaining the controls which have been in effect since early 1951 and which have helped to maintain price stability since that time.

As a matter of fact, the news story in the Journal of Commerce on June 20 contained two paragraphs immediately following the limited portion of the news story quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 8067. In other words, the quotation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD did not go far enough to show my views correctly. These two additional paragraphs in the Journal of Commerce news story read as follows:

"In declaring that there is no danger of booming inflation during the next months, the council chairman injected the customary warning that his prediction could be upset by a marked worsening in international conditions or a sudden shift in consumer psychology.

"At the same time, he said that because of these dangers he would not torpedo the tattered remnants of the controls program."

The foregoing quotation makes it absolutely clear that even the Journal of Commerce news story left no doubt that I am in favor of the retention of the remnants of the controls program which was still in effect on June 19, despite previous weakening, and that I am not in favor of the torpedoing of price and wage controls.

Let me emphasize again, as I did in my letter to you yesterday, that I am simply responding to your request for information about my views, and do not desire to engage in any debate with any Member of Congress or to intrude in any way upon legislative functions. If any Member of Congress has conveyed an erroneous impression of my views, I am sure that this was done unintentionally.

Very sincerely yours,
LEON H. KEYSERLING,
Chairman.

When naked Communist aggression forced America into the Korean conflict, this Congress took prompt and effective action to ward off a disastrous inflation and preserve a sound economy by sponsoring a price stabilization program which was enacted and has been maintained throughout the period of the Korean struggle. As a result, the soundness of our American dollar has been maintained, the disruption of our civilian economy minimized, and America's internal stability and strength preserved. And all this was achieved while our defense production program was notably advanced.

America's internal stability is a vital front in its defense against Communist aggression; and only selfish, irresponsible leadership would jeopardize America's future by premature relaxation of measures designed to prevent the undermining and crippling of that stability. American defenses for peace can only be as effective as its economy is strong. The military front is only an extension of the home front.

We must make ourselves militarily secure, safeguard our economy from the dangers of runaway inflation with all its consequent social chaos and human ruin.

Only a strong America can be a free America, and provide the world leadership needed to combat the growing menace of international communism.

Do not scrap controls—if you do you will present Stalin with a priceless boon in the Kremlin's drive for world conquest.

[From the Washington Star of June 25, 1952]

UNITED STATES LEADERS DOUBT LESSENING OF RISK OF WAR WITH RUSSIA

The possibility of war with Russia has not lessened in the past year, the Nation's top military and diplomatic leaders believe.

Their views on the subject were given to the House Appropriations Committee during hearings on a bill financing the foreign-aid program. The committee, which took the testimony in closed session, made parts of it public yesterday.

While none of the witnesses was overly pessimistic, most of them cautioned against a slowing down of the aid program at a time when the defenses of the free world are being built up with American help.

Here is what they said when asked about "the possibility of war:"

LOVETT SEES EVIL PATTERN

Defense Secretary Lovett: "It seems to me that there is an evil pattern visible today both in the Far East and in the west * * * and that pattern is the violence and the reckless character of the propaganda war which is conducted by the Soviets and their satellites. I believe it is recognized that an essential part of the military strategy of the Communists is the initial build-up of a strategic propaganda barrage the degree of tension developed is greater than it was 1 year ago."

Averell Harriman, Mutual Security Director: "I think if the Congress appropriates adequate sums of money for carrying forward the program, it (the possibility of war) is substantially less."

HAVE CHANCE TO ACT

Secretary of State Acheson: "We now have a very good chance to make certain that no such tragedy (as control of most of the world by an aggressive tyranny) will ever occur * * * throughout most of the world, our hands are not tied. We have a chance to act, while action still counts. We have an opportunity to create an edifice of strength which will shelter our own security and foster the continued growth of the ideals and institutions which we cherish."

W. J. Kenny, Deputy Mutual Security Director: "I would say the stresses are as great today as they have ever been."

COMMENT ON THE TALLE AMENDMENT

This amendment would terminate all price control on June 30, 1952, except for materials that are allocated or rationed.

In effect, this amendment would end all the protection against inflation which the Government now provides for the consumer. It would terminate most price control.

The exception provided for materials under allocation or rationing would not preserve price control where it is most needed. Allocation and rationing means that the businessman is told to whom he may sell his goods, how much of them and, perhaps, for what purpose. So ruthless an interference with the free market is justifiable only where a material is needed for the defense program and its supply is so short that defense needs could not be met without allocation.

But the general inflationary trend resulting from the defense program causes price pressure for many commodities whose allocation would not be justified.

Bread and meat prices may rise 5 or 10 or 20 percent, causing hardship to many consumers, but, under this amendment, their prices could not be controlled unless they were also rationed.

Fencing wire or cotton-ginning machinery may be raised in price unreasonably—and nothing could be done about it under this amendment unless farmers and ginners were also made to submit to the needless red tape of allocation.

In fact, this amendment would remove all protection of price control from consumers, farmers, and most businessmen.

Every Member who wants to be on record against price control should vote for this amendment. Every Member who wants to protect the country against inflation should vote against it. This amendment should be defeated.

The Talle amendment is shortsighted.

It is based on the theory that prices will go up only when there is a shortage of supply.

I hope that the memory of this House is not short enough to fall for a theory which has so recently been proven completely wrong before our own eyes.

There was no shortage of anything after Korea. You could buy all you wanted. But prices went up, and fast.

There was no shortage of rubber; you could buy all you wanted, but it went up 187 percent.

There was no shortage of wool; you could buy all you wanted, but it went up 118 percent.

There was no shortage of cotton print cloth; you could buy all you wanted, but it went up 58 percent.

There was no shortage of beef cattle; you could buy all you wanted, but it went up 30 percent.

There was no shortage of lard; you could buy all you wanted, but it went up 84 percent.

It is true that there was acute international tension and fear of war at that time. But, is there no tension today? Can we be sure that there will be no fear of war next week or next month, or next September or October?

Prices could skyrocket again in September or October. The American people would not want that to happen. But the Government could not do anything about it if the Talle amendment were enacted.

The Talle amendment must be voted down.

PRICES WILL GO HIGHER WITHOUT CONTROLS

First. Businessmen are asking OPS for higher ceiling prices.

Food retailers want higher prices.

Milkmen want higher prices.

Packers want higher prices.

Machine manufacturers want higher prices.

Gasoline refiners want higher prices.

Cement manufacturers want higher prices.

Second. National security expenditures will increase $15,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000 during the next year.

Before Korea they were $17,000,000,000 per year—6 percent of our national output.

In the first quarter of 1952 they were $47,000,000,000—14 percent of our national output.

Next year they will be $65,000,000,000—18 percent of our national output.

Add to this a vast expansion of private facilities.

You cannot dump that much added spending on an economy which is already operating practically at capacity and expect prices to control themselves.

Third. Lifting price control will raise prices by causing scare buying.

Right after Korea:

There were no shortages.

The budget was balanced.

Defense spending had not really started.

Yet, people were scared of higher prices.

They rushed out and bought goods they didn't need.

They bid up prices.

Prices rose 8 percent in 7 months.

Today people are confident and savings are at record levels.

If price controls are lifted, they will be scared again.

They will spend instead of saving. They will bid up prices.

WITHOUT CONTROLS PRICES WILL GO UP EVEN IF THERE ARE NO SHORTAGES

First. Right after Korea, prices went up when there were no shortages.

After Korea the budget was balanced; defense spending had not really started; there were no shortages.

Yet prices went up 8 percent in 7 months.

Second. Prices are pressing ceilings and businessmen are asking OPS for higher prices in areas where supplies are plentiful.

There is no milk shortage, yet milkmen want higher prices.

There is no oil shortage, yet oilmen want higher prices.

There is no cigarette shortage, yet cigarette men want higher prices.

Third. Prices will go higher because demand will be high even if materials are plentiful.

(a) Defense spending will increase fifteen to twenty billion dollars to a total of $65,000,000,000 within a year. This will mean more dollars to bid up prices.

(b) If controls are removed people will start scare buying just like they did after Korea. This will increase demand and push up prices.

The issue is prices—not supplies, and prices will go up if controls are removed.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I of the bill? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

SEC. 201. (a) Subsection (e) of section 4 of the Housing and Rent of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

(b) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

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

Mr. Chairman, I have heard certain criticisms, and what has been said regarding Hon. Ellis G. Arnall, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization. I feel it is my duty, and it certainly is a privilege to rise at this point to his defense and to refute what has been said regarding his work here. Mr. Arnall is a distinguished Georgian, a former Governor of our great State, I have known him all of his life; he was born and reared and still resides in my home town. He is a man of honor, integrity, and courage, and possesses the highest educational qualifications, and can hold his place anywhere with any man in this country.

I happen to know what time he is devoting to the duties of his office. I have made many appointments with him for people who sought his advice and his instruction regarding price matters. I know of many conferences he has had with them after supper, at late hours in the evening, when he could not get to them in the daytime. If anyone says he is running around the country only acting as a public-relations officer, that person simply does not know what he is talking about. No man in this country is better versed in price-control matters. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BROWN, vice chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee has told me that no witness who testified before that committee had a better knowledge or keener appreciation of his work nor was more sincere in his efforts.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield for an observation?

Mr. CAMP. Gladly.

Mr. COX. I simply want to say that I never voted for Governor Arnall in my life. Politically speaking, we have been as far apart, almost, as the poles. I expect that I have criticized him as much as any person living. But I do feel it is fair to say that as Office of Price Stabilization Administrator he has been the most courteous man I have known in the carrying along of his work in Washington. I have confidence in his integrity. I have the faith to believe that he is doing his utmost to do a good job, and therefore I regret the criticism, indirect though it may be, but criticism nevertheless which has been aimed at him.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to say that any job which Ellis Arnall undertakes to do, he will try to do it to the best of his ability, and his ability is great.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I have known Ellis Arnall for a great many years. I know of no man who has been more painstaking and more efficient in carrying out his duties, not only as Governor of his State, because he was a great credit to his State when he was Governor, but in carrying out his duties as head of the OPS. It is a very difficult and arduous task, but he has carried on forthrightly and honestly and with the greatest integrity.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I have not been acquainted with Governor Arnall for a long period, but it has impressed me that everything you say about him is true. He is a high-class gentleman who has a public spirit, and he is trying to carry out the duties of his office to the very best of his ability. He is subjected to that criticism which falls on every man who offers himself for public service, and it falls upon the best just as it falls upon the worst.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I have known ex-Governor Arnall, the present price administrator, for a number of years. As a matter of fact, since he was a young man. I want to join with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] in what he has said in praise of Ellis Arnall as well as with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and other Members who have spoken. I have the utmost confidence in his integrity. I know he is an able and capable man trying to do a good job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately prior to the closing of debate on title I.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: Page 11, line 20, insert the following new sections:

"SEC. 202. Section 204 (j) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(4) No action taken under this section 204 (j) shall be valid unless the President certifies that the vacancy ratio in low and middle income housing accommodations in the area to be affected by such action is 10 percent or more of the available habitable housing accommodations in that area.'"

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes 18, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHEELER: On page 11 strike out lines 17 to 20, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) (1) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of September 30, 1952, except that they shall cease to be in effect at the close of March 31, 1953—

"'(A) in any area which prior to or subsequent to September 30, 1952, is certified under subsection (1) of section 204 of this act as a critical defense housing area;

"'(B) in any incorporated city, town, or village which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, or village; and

"'(C) in any unincorporated locality in a defense-rental area in which one or more incorporated cities, towns, or villages constituting the major portion of the defense-rental area have made the declaration specified in subparagraph (B) at a time when maximum rents under this title were in effect in such unincorporated locality.

"'(2) Any incorporated city, town, or village which makes the declarations specified in paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken.

"'(3) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect upon the date of a proclamation by the President or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this title is not necessary because of the existence of an emergency, whichever date is the earlier.

"'(4) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) or (3) of this subsection, the provisions of this title and regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit or action with respect to any right or liability incurred prior to the termination date specified in such paragraph.'"

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, it will not require 5 minutes to explain this amendment. The amendment simply provides that on the 30th of September next rent control will cease to be in existence in all areas except in critical defense areas or in those areas where the local governing authorities ask that Federal rent control be extended.

In order to get rid of rent control under the present law, where Federal rent control is in effect, the local governing authorities are required to formally ask that it be discontinued. This amendment simply reverses that procedure and allows control to expire on September 30, 1952, unless the local governing authorities take positive action requesting the President to impose control. It does not affect, until after the 31st of March, 1953, the rent control status of the critical defense areas that have been so designated. It is simply a question of whether you want rent control to continue to be imposed on those communities unless they take positive action and ask for it. It does not in any way affect rent control in the critical defense areas.

The question is that simple.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKINNON. Do I understand your amendment would provide that in areas now under rent control, that are considered critical impact areas, this status would not be changed until possibly March, 1953?

Mr. WHEELER. March 31, 1953.

Mr. McKINNON. But in case of another area that becomes impacted by a military operation, if the Federal Government wanted to put Federal rent control into effect in that impacted area, it could not do so without the consent of the local governing body? Do I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. WHEELER. That is right.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Your amendment says in critical areas now existing. Your amendment has no effect on them.

Mr. WHEELER. That is right.

Mr. McDONOUGH. If under the terms of the Rent Control Act an area surveyed to be made critical, do you provide that the local governing body must determine whether the Federal authorities are ready to make it a critical area?

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry. I gave the gentleman from California the wrong information. Where it has been declared a critical defense area, rent control automatically goes on until March 31, 1953, without any determination by the local authorities. Where it has been declared to be a critical defense area the Federal rent-control law applies automatically until March 31, 1953.

Mr. McKINNON. But any new area would not be able to be controlled unless the local government took positive action.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; it would come under control immediately upon the determination that it was a critical defense area.

Mr. McKINNON. What happens after March 1953 on a present impact area that now has rent control?

Mr. WHEELER. That remains for the next Congress to determine.

Mr. McKINNON. There is no provision in the gentleman's amendment for such contingency?

Mr. WHEELER. Not beyond March 1953. It merely says that in these noncritical areas the rent control law shall cease as of September 30 this year unless the local governing authorities request the President to extend it. It does not go off in critical areas until March 1953.

Mr. McKINNON. The gentleman knows that many places throughout the country will become critical defense areas soon because of our new defense effort.

Mr. WHEELER. They will be controlled.

Mr. McKINNON. In other words, in a newly created impact area because of national defense there can be no rent control until the local governing authorities take affirmative action.

Mr. WHEELER. Once it has been determined to be a critical defense area they need take no action whatsoever.

Mr. McKINNON. Between now and March.

Mr. WHEELER. March 1953.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman know that not one of the principal cities of this country has been defined to be a critical defense area? If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, rent control in cities like Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and other places that do not have State rent control laws would automatically be decontrolled.

Mr. WHEELER. If the local governing authorities wanted it, they could simply ask for it.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows that if they do not want it they can bring themselves out from under rent control right now; they have done it in many places throughout the country. The present law permits decontrol by action of the local authorities.

Mr. WHEELER. My amendment merely requires affirmative action instead of negative action.

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

Mr. Chairman, the original act was passed on the theory that the people wanted local self-government; that particularly appealed to the people of the South. We gave them local self-government with reference to rent control; they can impose it or they can take it off as they please.

This amendment, as I understand, would take away that right, and on September 30 of this year all of the areas that are not critical defense areas would be decontrolled without local action. We have reversed the attitude we took, and we have taken away from the people the authority they asked us for.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WHEELER: On page 11, strike out lines 17 to 20 inclusive and insert the following:

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) (1) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of June 30, 1952, except that they shall cease to be in effect on March 31, 1953, in any area which prior to or subsequent to June 30, 1952, is certified under subsection (1) of section 204 of this act as a critical defense housing area.

"'(2) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect upon the date of a proclamation by the President or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this title is not necessary because of the existence of an emergency, whichever date is the earlier.

"'(3) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection, the provisions of this title and regulations, orders and requirements thereunder shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit or action with respect to any right or liability incurred prior to the termination date specified in such paragraph'."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete sympathy with what the gentleman from Georgia seeks to do by his amendment. Nevertheless, in my opinion, the time has come for us to meet the issue of Federal rent control head-on.

In 1949 Congress provided for "local option" rent control, giving the right to the local communities and the States to decontrol their areas if they saw fit. That was the first step toward placing rent control in the hands of the local and State governments.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] retains Federal rent control, but regardless of what might be said, it does not give the local communities full and complete responsibility in the matter of these controls.

In my opinion, the time has come for the Federal Government to relinquish this responsibility. We should turn it over completely to the States.

Because of the local option provision in the rent-control bill, there are only scattered sections throughout the country that still retain Federal rent control outside critical defense areas. In those areas designated as critical defense areas, it should be provided by the Federal Government In other words, it is the Federal Government's responsibility to control rents where the critical situation is caused by action of the Federal Government. Therefore, in the amendment I have offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], we would leave rent control in the critical areas to be administered by the Federal Government but return to the States the responsibilities that are rightfully theirs by decontrolling once and for all the rest of the country that does not need Federal rent contral.

It will be agreed that my proposal would leave certain parts of the country without rent control, particularly the large cities. Well, several of the States have already decontrolled themselves; several States, so I understand, have stand-by legislation that goes into effect the minute the Federal Government abandons rent control.

There is no reason why the State, county, and local governing bodies cannot meet and provide controls for themselves if such necessity presents itself.

If rent control is to be a permanent function of the Federal Government, then vote my amendment down; if you believe that it is a Federal responsibility to continue to control rents, regardless of the fact that the need is not national, then vote my amendment down.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. In the gentleman's substitute does he have a provision when the present law is to expire or does it expire on June 30?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. On June 30.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman does not have a provision in there that it expires on September 30?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No.

Mr. JONAS. That raises the point in metropolitan areas, like the city of Chicago, and I use the city of Chicago simply as an example. If we follow the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], we are apt to walk into the same trap we did in 1948. The 60-day notices will be served on the tenants just about 2 days before election day, and I do not want to get into that situation. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment, this expires on June 30?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I presume that in the city of Chicago you have a city governing body?

Mr. JONAS. Yes; but under existing law the city council has no jurisdiction over passing on any question dealing with rent control. Under the prevailing law, as we have it now, they do not have that jurisdiction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman has a very distinguished Governor who is trying to slip into the back door of the White House. I have heard a lot down South about his belief in States' rights. I am sure that the gentleman's "States' rights" Governor will be pleased to see to it that the Illinois Legislature takes care of your situation in the next few weeks. If my amendment is accepted, it will remove some, if not all, of the present Federal interference into private business and local affairs.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi about his amendment. As I understand his amendment, the difference between that and the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Georgia, as far as impacted areas are concerned, is that the Federal Government may only step in and control rents in areas that had not been declared critical prior to June 30 of this year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the gentleman will read the amendment, the amendment reads as follows: With reference to critical areas it says that—

The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of June 30, 1952, except that they shall cease to be in effect on March 31, 1953, in any area which prior to or subsequent to June 30, 1952, is certified under subsection (1) of section 204 of this act as a critical defense housing area.

Mr. McKINNON. In other words, the gentleman's amendment permits rent control set up to be initiated by the Federal Government on impacted areas throughout the United States now or at a later time up to March 1953?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is right.

Mr. McKINNON. In other words, the Federal Government can control rents in impacted areas without the consent of the local governing bodies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is correct, but it has to be certified as a critical defense area.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Wheeler amendment and to the Williams amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a few months ago I had the privilege of addressing the legislative section of the National Association of Rural Electrification Cooperatives. To that legislative panel came representatives from rural sections all over the United States, many of them unaware of the peculiar and critical problems facing those of us who live in metropolitan areas. I asked them to turn north as they walked out of the hotel so that they would see the district within the city of Chicago which I represent, a district which contains approximately 335,000 people within an area of three square miles. That is a lot of people. They live in huge multistoried apartment buildings, small and medium apartment buildings, and in private homes. They are crowded together. They are congested. They have made use of almost every housing accommodation in the city, including those which a few years ago, relatively, were classified as uninhabitable. They depend upon rent control to tide them over this temporary period of housing shortage, for if rent controls are removed, there are no apartments or houses into which they can move at rentals they can afford to pay. I feel sure that the people to whom I spoke that day gained a fine appreciation of our housing problems, an appreciation they did not have before.

Much has been said during this debate on items in abundant supply. The gentleman from South Carolina spoke of warehouses filled with refrigerators and other consumer items. Other gentlemen have spoken of potatoes and fresh fruits and vegetables. In this bill we must make the determination as to whether the items that are sought to be brought under control are in sufficient supply. If they are, controls will be no longer needed. Yet I would like to point out one significant difference, between shortages in housing and food. If controls are removed and food and food- commodities, and prices go up, consumers can still shop around for cheaper foods. They can find substitutes for foods which become too expensive or for clothing which becomes too expensive, if need be. But housing is in a different category. If there are no housing accommodations on the market, you cannot shop for them or buy them or even try to find a substitute, because no substitutes exist.

Let me read to you from the report of the Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council of the city of Chicago, a very recent report issued on February 29, 1952. The Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council is a private agency, not a Government agency, and is established for the purpose of promoting better housing throughout the city of Chicago. It numbers among its members some of the largest real estate dealers in the city of Chicago. The report which is entitled "Chicago and Its Housing Supply" makes clear exactly what the housing shortage is. Let me read to you the following:

In 1940, 3.8 percent of the total dwelling units in the city of Chicago were vacant, for sale or for rent, while in the metropolitan area outside of the city of Chicago, there were 2.2 percent of the total dwelling units which were vacant and for sale or rent. In 1950, this vacancy rate of inhabited or inhabitable units had fallen to 0.8 percent in the city of Chicago, and to 0.7 percent in the metropolitan area outside the city.

With this vacancy factor, do you believe that people who have their rents raised beyond their means can find other quarters at prices they can afford to pay? Of course they cannot. I read further:

The vacancy rate which will insure that persons seeking housing will have a minimum amount of freedom of choice in the housing market ranges from a minimum of 2½ percent to a maximum of 6 percent. This percent of the dwelling units in a city the size of Chicago must at all times be vacant and on the market for sale or rent, to provide the frictional buffer to care for the constant movement of persons into and out of housing, and into and out of the city itself.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments offered by both the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Mississippi limiting rent controls to critical areas completely overlook the needs of the people in the tremendous crowded urban communities today because not one of such communities has been classified as a critical defense area. If either of these amendments prevails, if rent control is removed, there will be chaos in large communities such as the city of Chicago. There will of necessity have to be demands for wage increases, giving another push to the inflationary spiral, for the tenants will have to have some means of obtaining increased rents to pay for shelter they must have. The number of our families is growing; the population is growing out of all proportion to the number of housing accommodations presently in existence and being built. This is a problem that can be licked only by building more and more housing—to unfreeze and liberalize the limited housing market.

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

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

Mr. SITTLER. The gentleman has just made some statements about the city of Chicago that are quite revealing to me. I wonder if it is not true that under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia the people of Chicago, who know about that very well, and the governing officials could thereupon invoke rent control in the city just as well. I wonder if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia does not meet very completely the situation the gentleman is speaking about.

Mr. YATES. A few years ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered an amendment which he said would provide for local control. It would give the right to local communities to take themselves out from rent control in the event they thought it was necessary. That part of the law is still in effect. If a local community does not want rent control, they can take themselves out from under rent control under the local-option provision, as many have done already in the past few years.

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

Mr. Chairman, my city and State have local rent controls, so these amendments cannot affect my city or State. I think you can then consider what I have to say on the subject as being entirely objective.

Both these amendments will not only decontrol large cities but will also decontrol many small cities. I have in my hand a list of cities which either one of these two amendments, if adopted, would immediately decontrol.

In the State of Georgia, which is represented in part by the gentleman who offered the first amendment, we find that there will be immediate decontrol under either amendment of the following cities: Atlanta, Macon, Albany, Rome, Athens, and Americus.

There are 36 States and Puerto Rico in which hundreds of cities would be immediately decontrolled.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. The State of Mississippi passed a law that you cannot have rent control. If the Office of Rent Control here does not know it, it had better find out about it.

Mr. MULTER. In the State of Mississippi only those cities are under rent control which are in critical defense areas.

Mr. MORTON. These are defense impact cities.

Mr. MULTER. Right.

Mr. MORTON. The gentleman's amendment permits them to continue controls.

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

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

Mr. SITTLER. I, too, am objective about the situation in the State of Mississippi and in these small communities because I do not live in them.

But I wonder if the gentleman does not accord to the governing bodies of these small communities the native in-

telligence to handle their own problems and invoke rent control if it is necessary. Whom does the gentleman fear?

Mr. MULTER. I do not fear anybody, but we know the pressures upon the local city councils and the local governing bodies are such that they will not take the action that is required.

Mr. SITTLER. By whom is the pressure exerted?

Mr. MULTER. The same persons who pressure us year after year to discontinue rent control throughout the country.

Mr. SITTLER. Who exerts these terrible pressures, if the gentleman will tell us?

Mr. MULTER. You know these local councils have not been taking any such action with the exception of Los Angeles, I think, which is the only local council in the country that has taken such action. The State of Mississippi, as a State, has done so. What other local governing body in the country has taken such action?

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. In answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, let me say that the city council of the city of Chicago in 1947, at the time when it appeared that rent control was going off the books, passed an ordinance providing for the continuation of rent control. That ordinance was held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois on the theory that the legislature had not given the city council that legislative authority to pass the ordinance. In the State of Illinois, we have a fight, or rather we have a misunderstanding with some of the down-State communities as to what our problems in the city of Chicago are. We would have a terrible time trying to get rent control legislation through the legislature of the State of Illinois, because there is no appreciation of our peculiar problems within the city of Chicago. Therefore, the only protection we have to obtain rent control, and to keep rent control, is to have the act continued.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SITTLER. Then what the gentleman from Chicago would do would be to remove by one further step from the city of Chicago the responsibility for the management of that city. He cannot handle it in his own State legislature, therefore, he wants to push it all the way to the National Capitol in Washington.

Mr. YATES. On the contrary, if Chicago wants local control, we cannot have local control because of the legislative situation. We want rent control, but cannot get it as a result of the lack of legislative power, which the State legislature will not give the city.

Mr. MULTER. The advocates of local option overlook the fact that these amendments would automatically decontrol these small cities, as well as many large ones. The right given by the amendments to recontrol could never be invoked by them because their States have never given them that legislative authority.

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

Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few brief observations. Under the present law, outside of defense critical areas, as I understand it, and if I am mistaken I would like to be corrected, a community or city can only be taken out of rent control by action on the part of the city or community through negative action. Of course, the legislature has power to do it so far as the application of rent control to the entire State is concerned. So when I use the word "community" I am referring to it in its broad as well as limited sense.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], as I understand it, does not disturb the basic situation in relation to rent control outside of critical defense areas except that instead of negative action on the part of the State, county, city, or town, or any other political subdivision of a State, it requires that they take affirmative action in order to have rent control continued, and by rent control I mean outside of a critical defense area. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi completely terminates rent control, as I understand it, outside of critical defense areas. It seems to me, in the light of the present emergency, there is a necessity for the continuance of rent control. I hope the Williams amendment will be defeated.

Now coming to the Wheeler amendment, and expressing my own views, there is a question involved there as between the present law and whether it should be negative or affirmative action to have rent control. I recognize that men may honestly differ on that. I had not intended to speak on the Wheeler amendment, if it was confined to the Wheeler amendment, so my main purpose in taking the floor in this discussion is, with all due respect to the gentleman from Mississippi, to express the hope that his substitute amendment will be defeated. While personally I might feel that the present law would bring about the greatest results, and I shall vote against the Wheeler amendment, the principle or the policy or the idea involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] in relation to the affirmative action on the part of the community in order to have rent control is one on which persons may, as I say, honestly differ. My main purpose is to express the hope that the Williams substitute will be defeated.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. There is a point that I think is a very fine point, as to whether the governing body should have any say so or not. For the information of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the rest of the Members, I asked Mr. Tighe Woods during the hearing that very question. I asked him:

What do you think of an amendment providing that after the survey is made in an area to determine whether it is a critical area or not, is presented to the local governing body for review?

Mr. Woods said:

Actually we have been doing that informally, and such an amendment would not bother me at all.

Now, there is the Administrator saying that cooperation with the local governing body is a good thing, and I think for that reason this amendment should be approved.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I said, with all due respect to my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], my main purpose is to call attention to the complete termination of rent control, if a situation existed where it was reasonably necessary. The difference in the Wheeler amendment—and it is an important difference—is whether a community should be permitted to say they did not want it, or they should be compelled to say, "We want it."

May I ask a question of the gentleman? In the event your amendment is adopted and it should become incorporated into law, in a case like Chicago or Boston—I do not mean to confine my inquiry to large metropolitan cities alone, but there are hundreds of thousands of population in other cities, the local, duly elected city authorities, the city council or selectmen, or whatever they may be called, duly elected in accordance with its municipal charter, would they be the agency or authority to affirmatively request rent control?

Mr. WHEELER. Absolutely.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, it would not have to be submitted to the people for a vote?

Mr. WHEELER. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. It could be done through their duly elected officials?

Mr. WHEELER. Through their duly elected officials.

Mr. YATES. They have that right at the present time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The one thing that I have taken the floor particularly for is to call attention to the fact that the Williams amendment means the death of anything being done in relation to rent control outside of critical defense areas. While I do not favor the Wheeler amendment, I hope that the Williams amendment will be defeated.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] a question about his amendment, as I agree with him it is time for the local communities to take the responsibility and say affirmatively whether there is a local emergency condition that requires rent control. In large cities there are various parts of a city that do not currently need rent control. Under the gentleman's amendment, I wonder if there is a possibility for the particular municipality, by its own vote, by a designation of wards or sections, having rent control in one portion and releasing it in another portion where rent control is not needed.

Mr. WHEELER. The amendment anticipates the local governing authorities knowing more about their needs, insofar as rent control is concerned, than does any agency of the Federal Government. I could very well envision under this amendment the local governing authority of any city doing pretty much as they please about the imposition of rent control.

Mr. FULTON. That means that within a town or city, under this amendment, they could have a part or all of the city under rent control if they so wanted it. For instance, sections or wards that do not need rent control, under certain standards of living, and having adequate supply of a particular level of housing, might be decontrolled, and other parts of the municipality that do need it will have rent control according to the local agency's authorization. The local community can and should decide its own problems on rent control.

Mr. WHEELER. I believe this amendment is broad enough to take care of that situation.

Mr. FULTON. That is what I wanted to make sure. Blanket action on a national level is causing inequities and injustices in the administration of rent control at present. I believe the local real-estate dealers and owners at present have legitimate complaint on the administration of rent control from Washington.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman is familiar with the Housing and Rent Act which states that if an area is decontrolled, the director is then directed to decontrol the surrounding area to a certain extent; it is a matter of reasonableness in order to prevent discrimination, because if you decontrolled a certain area of the city but left the remainder of the city controlled you might have discrimination that would not be equitable.

Mr. FULTON. I think the position of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] and mine is that there should be the right within the particular municipality or local subdivision to decide what portion of that subdivision shall be under rent control or shall be released, not that the local municipality must act as an open or shut matter so that the whole municipality is under rent control or the whole municipality released from rent control.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think this amendment would place in the hands of the local authorities that determination.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

I come from a large industrial, residential and farm area, parts of which want rent control and need it, and the other parts and subdivisions and municipalities do not want it and do not need it. Some of the communities in my district have been released from rent control.

I shall be glad to support the Wheeler amendment because it will give to the local communities this right to determine whether they locally have an emergency, and the decision should be in local hands. If the communities do not have an emergency, then through their elected officials they can say there is no such emergency and they do not want rent control. As a matter of fact we in Congress on all these emergency regulation and control acts should be looking toward the time when the controls come off, and work toward that end. A free economy works best. Because we have been operating and governed on emergency after emergency and control after control, some New Deal people in the Government use this as a method to stay in power and keep controls on indefinitely. We in Congress must work toward a free economy and the relaxing of controls as soon as the emergency conditions lessen. Otherwise the American people face a permanent controlled economy. Rather than have rent control entirely under the Federal Government, I think it is one step toward decentralization in requiring affirmative action by the local community to decide whether under the Federal act they have such an emergency that their individual community requires rent control. In that part of the community where rent control is needed, it will be continued and where it is not needed it will be released by the local community officials.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. My question is: Have these local bodies the authority in all cases to act affirmatively?

Mr. FULTON. I believe that the action will be by resolution or by ordinance of the local authority. That then will be the method by which it is determined whether the conditions of this national act have been complied with in each case.

It is not a case, I believe, as the gentleman from Illinois has been trying to argue, that the local authorities take an action under the State law or constitution. That does not have any bearing whatever, as the local community by its action is simply meeting the conditions or requirements of the Federal statute.

Mr. YATES. I did not say that.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I did not say that the local authorities should take any unconstitutional action. I stated that the Supreme Court of Illinois had declared unconstitutional the effort of the city of Chicago to provide rent control, because the city had not been delegated such authority by the State Legislature. Under this amendment, there might be the question again whether the city can vote controls without specific legislative grant of authority.

Mr. FULTON. Under the Federal statute the local municipal authority is given the right to say whether or not they want rent control. Once the municipality complies with that statute or the regulations under it, the action becomes effective regardless of State law. That is the deciding factor.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does this have any effect on section 202?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not; the request applies only to the pending amendment and amendments thereto.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Chairman, there has been some effort to confuse what the basic issues are here, particularly as between the Wheeler amendment and the Williams amendment. The fundamental issue raised by the Williams amendment is the question, Who is going to assume the responsibility for control in an area where control may be found to be needed? The Williams amendment simply says that if controls are needed in areas other than defense-impacted areas, then it is the local responsibility, they should set up their own rent-control offices and their own rent-control plan, that the Federal Government should not be forced into the responsibility of furnishing that service. If they need it, fine. We do not say they cannot have it. All we say is, you do it yourself in your own way and in your own manner. It seems to me that is the American way of doing it. In my judgment, the Williams amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the two pending amendments or at least one of them practically leaves the question of rent control in the hands of the local people. I cannot see any objection to that.

It is my purpose in taking this time to say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] who pointed out the critical rent situation in the city of Chicago that the city of Chicago has had rent control for 10 years. Does he propose to continue that same policy in the hope that he will obtain a solution of that problem in that city by continuing rent control as it is now?

Mr. YATES. In answer to the gentleman's question, I would say I do not like controls any more than the gentleman does, but where you have a monopolistic housing market as you do in many large cities today, where there is a housing shortage which does not permit freedom or opportunity to find a place to live at a reasonable rental, if rents are increased beyond the ability of consumers to pay, then I certainly believe rent controls should be retained.

Mr. DONDERO. There will be no houses built for rent by private owners or private investment as long as rent control hangs over the heads of the investors. That has caused the shortage

of houses in this country. It is also true in other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has expressed my own thoughts very clearly on this matter. In addition, as I understand it, the estimate is that the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] or the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] would save about $10,000,000 of administrative cost in the Division of Rent Control of OPA.

Mr. Chairman, if there is anything that should be subject to local option it is the matter of rent. On the basis of personal experience, as a former municipal official, I can testify that I was much better qualified to pass upon the need of my community of Uniontown for rent control, housing, or most anything else than was the then Member of this House who had the responsibility of representing our whole district, which contains several cities comparable to Uniontown and which are far removed from Washington.

To the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] may I say that the Legislature of the State of Illinois should provide relief for the city of Chicago by passing legislation to meet its needs. If relief for the city of Chicago is not to be found in the State capital of Illinois then State lines should not, in effect, be abolished by having every city go to the Federal Government for relief.

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

Mr. SITTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. May I say to the gentleman that he has argued favorably, and I agree with him, in favor of local option. You have that option under the present law because a municipality can take itself out from under rent control if it so desires.

Mr. SITTLER. I thank the gentleman for his agreement. I support the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] because I would put the force of inertia on the side of decontrol rather than on the side of controls. I have faith in the good judgment of the average city council and in its responsiveness to the local electorate. If the people of any city outside a critical defense area want rent controls they can get them through the action of their local officials.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in opposition to both amendments, because I represent, perhaps, the biggest bloc of low-income working people in the State of Minnesota. I have five wards that come in the category of low-income groups. Now I have watched this rent-control situation very carefully for a number of years, both as a member of our State legislature and serving on one of our municipal boards. Somebody asked a question a minute ago as to who puts the pressure on to kill rent controls. I do not think that question need be asked. We know it here in Washington. One of the strongest lobbies in Washington and one of the strongest in my State is the real-estate board. I witnessed a mass meeting in the city of Minneapolis that was called for the purpose of determining rent-control policy. Our State has a stand-by rent-control act. The result was that the city council of the city of Minneapolis listened and took the recommendation of about 40 members of the real-estate board, but when the opponents were heard there were over a thousand of them there protesting against the proposed decontrol legislation. This is a typical example of the power of organized power.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a good idea to let local people handle things as much as it is possible for them to do so. However, if Members on the left side of the aisle want fairly to get rid of rent control, I suggest they can do it in one very effective way; do not be so pinchpenny in the amount of money you allow every year for public housing for low-income families. Like housing our defense contracts are awarded on a Federal, not on a regional basis; when you make everything equal, either local or regional, and not just rent, you can handle rent lifting more equitably than the amendments allow. We could use many times more housing units in our area, before rents can be fairly decontrolled. We are not declared a war-impact area; we do not get war contracts; we are between New York and Pennsylvania; we are out in the cold. If you want to get rid of rent control fairly on a Federal basis, one way is to step up your allocation of low-income dwelling units. Both amendments should be defeated. The supply of low-income dwelling units does not equal by any means our needs.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I favor the Wheeler amendment. It carries out the principle of States' rights for which I have always fought and worked. It gives the decision to local authorities in reference to the continuation of rent controls. In the final analysis I believe local government in a general sense is the best government and this amendment certainly does decentralize the operations of rent control.

I think this amendment is a good amendment and should receive an overwhelming vote from the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Banking and Currency considered at length and heard from various witnesses on the necessity for the extension of rent control. We reported a bill that extends it for 1 year. It would certainly be inadvisable to extend it for just a few days when the people who are renters would have no opportunity to get sufficient notice of the conclusion of rent control. The great argument that was made for the present Rent Control Act was that it gave the local people the authority to manage their own affairs, based on the principle of local self-government. They can now do away with rent control at any time they desire. It seems to me that that system is far more preferable than for the United States Government to tell each section of the country whether they want control or not, that on September 30 of this year it will be ended.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment and the amendment thereto be defeated.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment to the Defense Production Act which would decontrol all localities except those which have been designated as critical defense housing areas should be defeated.

On the face of it—but only on the surface—this amendment sounds reasonable and logical. Any closer examination of the facts will reveal it for the trick and the sham that it is. This amendment purports to remove rent controls except from those areas which have been designated as critical. Any one of us might logically ask why rent controls should exist in any area unless the housing shortage is critical. To this there is only one answer. Rent controls should not exist unless there is a critical housing shortage in the area under control. However, the proponents of this amendment are fully aware that the critical is the technical and limited sense that is defined in Public Law 96.

Let us examine the facts as to what constitutes a critical area under Public Law 96.

The law specifically restricts certification as critical defense housing areas to those localities which meet all three of the following criteria: first, 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; second, substantial in-migration of defense workers or military personnel is required to carry out activities at such plant or installation; and third, 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 the activities of such defense plant or installation.

The proponents of this amendment know that under these complex restrictions that only 109 areas, containing some 550,000 rental housing units and a total population of around 8,000,000 persons, have been designated as critical.

They also realize that the majority of our industrial cities such as Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Boston, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and San Francisco would be decontrolled because of this amendment—simply because they could not meet one of the technical definitions of the word "critical" as it appears in Public Law 96. These cities are all highly important defense production centers, they simply cannot meet one condition proposed for critical designations, they have not had a substantial in-migration of labor. They have a critical housing

shortage—they have new and expanded defense plants—but they also have a nearly adequate local labor market.

The fact that these cities do not need any great in-migration of labor has nothing to do with whether the rents will skyrocket if controls are lifted in these great industrial cities. The plain fact is that these cities are of vital importance to the defense effort and the suspension of rent controls on these cities could only result in hampering defense production and adding another push to inflation and defense costs.

Nearly half of cities in the United States having more than 100,000 population now have rent stabilization of the "noncritical" type. More than 53,000,000 people live in communities which could be decontrolled by this proposal. For renters in these communities we would be tampering with the second most important component in their cost of living—their rent.

Even more important to me and to all believers in local self-determination, for the past several years the local people in all of these cities under noncritical rent stabilization have had the legal right to end rent stabilization for themselves through their local governing bodies. Are we to sit here in this Chamber and say that we in our wisdom know better than the local governing bodies of each of these communities that rent control is no longer needed in their city?

If the Federal rent control is onerous or unnecessary in these cities, the local governing body can abolish it through the simple process of passing a resolution to that effect after holding a hearing.

When a person examines the facts on the proposed amendment—he can only conclude that not only is it unwise but, also, it is an aid to inflation and a detriment to defense production. To an even greater extent it is an unnecessary amendment which attempts to make the judgment of the Congress superior to the judgment of local people who know the local situation.

I am attaching a list of cities in the United States now under rent control which would automatically be decontrolled if this amendment were adopted:

Cities with 1950 population in excess of 10,000, which are subject to rent control but are not located in critical defense housing areas as of May 29, 1952

(City and 1950 population)

ARKANSAS	
El Dorado	23,047
CALIFORNIA	
San Francisco	775,357
Richmond	99,545
Vallejo	26,038
Merced	15,278
San Pablo	14,476
San Lorenzo	14,000
Chico	12,312
COLORADO	
Denver	415,786
Pueblo	63,685
Boulder	19,916
Lakewood	15,000
Wheat Ridge	10,000
CONNECTICUT	
New Haven	164,443
Bridgeport	158,709
Waterbury	104,477
Stamford	74,293
New Britain	73,726
Norwalk	49,458
Bristol	35,873
West Haven	31,876
New London	30,367
Norwich	23,382
Greenwich	23,000
Danbury	22,424
Hamden	21,623
Ansonia	18,711
Naugatuck	17,463
Willimantic	13,565
Shelton	12,384
Thompsonville	11,000
Derby	10,264
DELAWARE	
Wilmington	110,356
FLORIDA	
Panama City	26,248
GEORGIA	
Atlanta	331,314
Macon	70,252
Albany	30,907
Rome	29,617
Athens	28,102
Americus	11,367
ILLINOIS	
Chicago	3,620,962
Peoria	111,856
Springfield	81,628
Evanston	73,641
Cicero	67,544
Oak Park Village	63,529
Aurora	50,576
Quincy	41,402
Waukegan	39,099
Danville	37,892
Bloomington	34,048
Belleville	32,701
Alton	32,176
Galesburg	31,357
Granite City	29,139
Maywood	27,409
Freeport	22,425
Pekin	21,912
Elmwood Park	18,771
Ottawa	16,951
Highland Park	16,767
Streator	16,442
Brookfield	15,484
Forest Park	14,946
Skokie	14,821
Lincoln	14,344
Melrose Park	13,109
LaSalle	12,023
Collinsville	11,907
Downers Grove	11,868
De Kalb	11,567
Dixon	11,532
Carbondale	10,911
Macomb	10,586
Evergreen Park	10,515
Wood River	10,217
Marion	10,130
INDIANA	
Gary	133,911
Evansville	128,636
South Bend	115,911
Terre Haute	64,214
Elkhart	35,556
Mishawaka	32,878
Michigan City	28,379
Logansport	20,933
La Porte	17,280
Goshen	12,977
Valparaiso	11,966
IOWA	
Des Moines	177,865
Sioux City	83,991
Cedar Rapids	72,296
Dubuque	49,528
Burlington	30,639
Iowa City	27,018
Fort Dodge	25,025
Keokuk	16,076
KANSAS	
Garden City	10,893
KENTUCKY	
Louisville	369,129
Lexington	55,534
Owensboro	33,983
Hopkinsville	12,531
Frankfort	11,949
St. Matthews	10,000
LOUISIANA	
New Orleans	570,445
Shreveport	127,206
Lake Charles	41,202
Bossier City	15,368
Gretna	13,848
MAINE	
Portland	77,634
Lewiston	41,142
Bangor	31,473
South Portland	21,732
Auburn	23,078
Westbrook	12,280
MARYLAND	
Baltimore	949,708
Silver Spring	44,294
Cumberland	37,632
Hagerstown	36,292
Bethesda	29,756
Frederick	18,092
Middle River	17,442
Catonsville	16,018
Dundalk (district 12)	15,436
Annapolis	15,016
Towson	14,778
District 13	13,366
Takoma Park	13,301
Hyattsville	12,288
College Park	11,137
Mount Rainier	10,978
Cambridge	10,366
MASSACHUSETTS	
Boston	801,444
Worcester	203,486
Springfield	162,399
Cambridge	120,740
Fall River	111,963
New Bedford	109,189
Somerville	102,351
Lynn	99,738
Lowell	97,249
Quincy	83,835
Newton	81,994
Lawrence	80,536
Medford	66,113
Brockton	62,860
Malden	59,804
Holyoke	54,661
Pittsfield	53,348
Chicopee	48,939
Haverhill	47,213
Waltham	47,198
Everett	45,789
Arlington	43,984
Fitchburg	42,671
Salem	41,842
Taunton	40,056
Chelsea	39,038
Watertown	37,339
Revere	36,663
Weymouth	32,695
Northampton	28,998
Beverly	28,855
Framingham	27,845
Belmont	27,379
Melrose	26,919
Gloucester	25,048
Methuen	24,411
Leominster	24,084
Attleboro	23,665
Braintree	23,130
Peabody	22,647
Milton	22,395
North Adams	21,475
Westfield	20,961
Wellesley	20,847
West Springfield	20,398
Woburn	20,269

Natick	19,663
Wakefield	19,600
Gardner	19,617
Winthrop	19,494
Dedham	18,499
Southbridge	17,511
Greenfield	17,237
Saugus	17,146
Lexington	17,098
Norwood	16,693
Needham	16,262
Marlboro	15,741
Danvers	15,702
Winchester	15,567
Milford	15,405
Newburyport	14,073
Reading	13,879
Marblehead	13,711
Plymouth	13,652
Webster	13,215
Stoneham	13,208
Fairhaven	12,811
Clinton	12,295
Andover	12,261
North Attleboro	12,119
Adams	12,027
Athol	11,540
Swampscott	11,535
Stoughton	11,139
Dartmouth	11,120
Amherst	10,850
Amesbury	10,810
Easthampton	10,694
Hingham	10,674
Barnstable	10,397
Northbridge	10,328
Middleboro	10,139
South Hadley	10,122
Randolph	10,007
MICHIGAN	
Detroit	1,849,568
Dearborn	94,994
Kalamazoo	57,704
Bay City	52,523
Highland Park	46,155
Hamtramck	43,245
Wyandotte	36,666
Monroe	21,275
River Rouge	20,366
St. Clair Shores	19,785
Benton Harbor	18,612
Ecorse	17,457
Livonia	17,413
Van Dyke	17,000
Midland	14,202
Niles	13,117
Albion	10,395
St. Joseph	10,123
MINNESOTA	
Minneapolis	521,718
St. Paul	311,349
Duluth	104,511
Rochester	29,634
St. Cloud	28,375
Austin	23,035
St. Louis Park	22,495
Mankato	18,785
Richfield	17,415
Hibbing	16,212
Faribault	16,012
South St. Paul	15,996
Moorhead	14,798
Albert Lea	13,488
Brainerd	12,558
Virginia	12,332
Robbinsdale	11,239
Owatonna	10,149
MISSOURI	
St. Louis	856,796
Kansas City	456,622
St. Joseph	78,588
Springfield	66,731
University City	39,595
Independence	36,832
Jefferson City	24,990
Cape Girardeau	21,539
Webster Groves	23,289
Kirkwood	18,587
Clayton	15,925
Jennings	15,236
Fairmount	15,000
Richmond Heights	14,827
St. Charles	14,307
Maplewood	13,238
Gravois	12,000
Ferguson	11,527
Overland	11,463
Luxemburg	10,686
MONTANA	
Missoula	22,320
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Manchester	82,732
Nashua	34,666
Berlin	16,545
NEW JERSEY	
Newark	438,776
Jersey City	299,017
Paterson	139,336
Trenton	128,009
Camden	124,555
Elizabeth	112,817
East Orange	79,340
Bayonne	77,203
Clifton	64,511
Atlantic City	61,657
Irvington	59,201
Passaic	57,702
Union City	55,537
Hoboken	50,676
Bloomfield	49,313
Montclair	43,775
Plainfield	42,212
Perth Amboy	41,291
Kearny	39,828
New Brunswick	38,768
Orange	38,413
West New York	37,754
Belleville	32,059
Linden	30,434
Hackensack	29,207
West Orange	28,624
Garfield	27,605
Nutley	26,746
Fair Lawn	23,865
Englewood	23,092
Long Branch	23,049
Westfield	21,335
Rahway	21,287
Phillipsburg	18,909
Summit	17,890
Roselle	17,646
Bergenfield	17,611
Rutherford	17,394
Cliffside Park	17,123
Morristown	17,078
Asbury Park	17,035
Millville	16,116
N. Arlington	15,977
East Paterson	15,391
Lodi	15,384
Collingswood	15,255
South Orange	15,175
Hawthorne	14,828
Gloucester	13,692
Harrison	13,535
Dumont	13,030
Carteret	13,003
North Plainfield	12,760
Red Bank	12,710
Princeton	12,160
Pleasantville	12,032
Ridgefield Park	12,001
Fort Lee	11,611
Somerville	11,566
Roselle Park	11,521
South River	11,323
NEW MEXICO	
Albuquerque	96,815
Roswell	25,572
Santa Fe	25,547
Clovis	17,168
NORTH CAROLINA	
Durham	71,311
Raleigh	65,679
Rocky Mount	27,644
Wilson	22,964
Salisbury	19,999
Lexington	13,562
Elizabeth City	12,332
Thomasville	11,126
NORTH DAKOTA	
Fargo	37,931
Grand Forks	26,617
Minot	21,924
Bismarck	18,544
Jamestown	10,601
OHIO	
Cleveland	914,808
Cincinnati	503,998
Columbus	375,901
Toledo	303,616
Akron	274,605
Dayton	243,872
Youngstown	168,330
Canton	116,912
Springfield	78,508
Cleveland Heights	59,141
Hamilton	57,951
Lorain	51,202
Lima	50,246
Warren	49,674
Mansfield	43,363
Euclid	41,447
Zanesville	40,424
East Cleveland	39,875
Portsmouth	36,663
Norwood	34,626
Newark	34,178
Marion	33,786
Middletown	33,634
Elyria	30,197
Sandusky	29,060
Parma	28,852
Barberton	27,893
Alliance	26,112
Garfield Heights	21,606
Chillicothe	20,121
Niles	16,733
Maple Heights	15,556
South Euclid	15,415
New Philadelphia	12,966
Xenia	12,871
Campbell	12,830
Bexley	12,235
Bowling Green	11,972
Struthers	11,905
Delaware	11,783
Sidney	11,413
Rocky River	11,036
Washington Court House	10,457
Conneaut	10,073
Girard	10,068
OKLAHOMA	
Ardmore	17,831
PENNSYLVANIA	
Philadelphia	2,071,605
Pittsburgh	676,806
Erie	130,803
Scranton	125,536
Reading	109,320
Allentown	106,756
Harrisburg	89,544
Altoona	77,177
Wilkes-Barre	76,826
Bethlehem	66,340
Chester	66,039
Lancaster	63,774
Johnstown	63,232
York	59,953
McKeesport	51,502
New Castle	48,563
Williamsport	44,964
Norristown	38,193
Hazelton	35,486
Easton	34,410
Sharon	26,305
Aliquippa	26,067
Washington	25,898
New Kensington	25,226
Pottsville	23,642
Butler	23,511
Pottstown	22,616
Kingston	21,061
Uniontown	20,432
Dunmore	20,302
Nanticoke	20,140

Clairton	19,418
Meadville	18,906
Monessen	17,929
West Mifflin	17,929
Duquesne	17,612
Greensburg	17,237
Chambersburg	17,205
State College	17,142
Shamokin	16,884
Braddock	16,518
Swissvale	16,467
Munhall	16,422
Ambridge	16,415
McKees Rock	16,278
Carbondale	16,235
Carlisle	16,232
Jeannette	16,179
Shenandoah	15,792
Sunbury	15,600
West Chester	15,109
Pittston	14,992
Warren	14,747
North Braddock	14,724
Hanover	16,439
Coatesville	13,839
Farrell	13,677
Connelsville	13,302
Darby	13,188
Plymouth	13,026
Phoenixville	12,913
Ellwood City	12,898
Dermont	12,731
Steelton	12,564
Turtle Creek	12,347
Brentwood	12,312
Carnegie	12,154
Lansdowne	12,140
Columbia	11,962
Latrobe	11,952
Donora	11,831
South Hills	11,750
Bellevue	11,573
Tamaqua	11,491
Lock Haven	11,325
Yeadon	11,322
Mahanoy City	10,930
Conshohocken	10,909
Springfield	10,500
Coraopolis	10,491
Waynesboro	10,321
Arnold	10,271
Homestead	10,031
RHODE ISLAND	
Providence	248,674
Pawtucket	81,436
Cranston	55,060
Woonsocket	50,211
Warwick	43,027
East Providence	35,791
Central Falls	23,610
North Providence	13,798
Cumberland	12,825
Johnston	12,735
Westerly	12,354
Bristol	12,311
Lincoln	11,020
SOUTH CAROLINA	
North Charleston	20,000
St. Andrews	15,000
SOUTH DAKOTA	
Sioux Falls	52,696
Aberdeen	20,976
Huron	12,713
TENNESSEE	
Memphis	396,000
Nashville	174,307
Oak Ridge	30,236
Columbia	10,921
VERMONT	
Burlington	33,039
Rutland	17,647
Barre	10,866
WASHINGTON	
Seattle	467,591
Everett	33,807
Walla Walla	24,071
Lake City	23,000
Riverton Heights	20,000
Renton	16,039
WEST VIRGINIA	
Huntington	86,353
Charleston	73,501
Wheeling	58,891
Clarksburg	31,817
Parkersburg	29,510
Fairmont	29,273
Morgantown	25,446
Weirton	24,143
Bluefield	21,341
South Charleston	16,627
Moundsville	14,759
WYOMING	
Cheyenne	31,807
Casper	23,557
Laramie	15,497
PUERTO RICO	
San Juan	169,247
Ponce	65,182
Mayaguez	50,376
Caguas	24,377
Arecibo	22,134
Rio Piedras	19,935
Guayania	16,913
Bayamon	14,596
Aguadilla	13,468

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EBERHARTER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill (H. R. 8210) back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I present this motion in all seriousness.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Banking and Currency, after extensive hearings and extensive consideration reported out a bill which purported and did to some extent control prices, wages, and rents. This House in Committee of the Whole saw fit to tear that bill, as reported out, to pieces, so that now we have before us and will have before us nothing but a skeleton without any meat on whatsoever; just a naked title to the bill.

When this committee adopted the so-called Talle amendment, it wiped out absolutely all controls as far as the housewife is concerned and also absolutely so far as all consumers are concerned. This was fortified by the amendment presented by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Harrison, which decontrols vegetables and fruits, including fresh vegetables and all canned fruits and vegetables, such as tomatoes and corn, and peas, and peaches, pears, in fact, practically all food it is possible to put in a can. Where does that leave the housewife, the consumer? There will be no controls whatsoever on food.

Then we have the Sadlak amendment, which will deny to the United States of America, in favor of the financially well heeled industrial corporations, the critical and strategic materials the Government of the United States and its Allies need for the defense of the free world.

Then the Lucas amendment hobbles a new Wage Stabilization Board so that it cannot pass upon fringe benefits, which are in many instances more important than the mere matter of wages and hours.

We have nothing left but a fiction here, Mr. Chairman. Why should we go through the agony of voting now after going through the agony of several days of passing upon amendments to this bill? The agony we have gone through is nothing whatsoever in comparison with the agony the Administrator of this act will go through.

I call your attention also, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that every businessman will suffer agonies in trying to interpret this measure and to obey the law as it will be. And what will the consumer go through, agonizing from day to day and week to week and month to month? We will also be passing upon something that will cause chaos in the labor market, in the business market, and in the financial market and cripple our efforts for defense.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee in its wisdom will see fit to refer this bill back to the committee with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out. Then if we want to pass upon a true price and wage control bill let the Committee on Banking and Currency report out a bill, which will meet the present conditions, and let us not go through the motions of passing nothing but a title, and attempt to fool the American people by saying that we passed price controls or wage controls. Vote one way or another, but do not try to sell this skeleton to the American public and the defense officials; do not say to the whole world that we here are in favor of inflation, and that we are not going to accept our responsibilities and take the lead in defending the free world. Are we playing the game just as Mr. Stalin predicted years ago when he said the United States would collapse economically and then the Soviet Union could take over not only all of these small nations in Europe and Asia, but later on gobble up the South American countries and finally the United States of America.

I hope my motion to strike out the enacting clause is adopted.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The amendments proposed by the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Mississippi will kill rent control.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The bill will, with the Wheeler amendment will kill rent control, so that we will have nothing whatsoever except the naked bones of a control act. That is all. So I think we ought to send it back to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. YATES. On June 8, 1952, the Washington Post contained an article in which there was a statement by the president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards that higher production costs will drive the prices of new houses up during the coming months; yet we propose to take rent control off by this amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I hope my motion will be adopted. If it is not adopted, well, I can truly say that I have tried to present the facts so that the people of the country are not fooled. They will see what the House has been doing here and can be guided accordingly when it comes to expressing their will in the future.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think any of my colleagues will believe that I am satisfied with this bill. I think it has been emasculated. I think it has been weakened, but I think it would be a great error to agree to the motion of the gentleman who has just preceded me. We have not yet ceased to consider this bill. We are going back into the House. We may have votes on some questions, the result of which may correct the errors we have made. It would certainly be a great mistake, because the bill has been weakened, to recommit it to the Committee on Banking and Currency. As much as I would like to see a better bill enacted, I do not know that we will succeed in doing any better if you recommit it than we have done. I would hate to see it come back to that committee. We will have no time to consider it. The sands are fast running out. It would be a tragedy if you do not maintain some semblance of price control and wage control. I am hopeful that the Members, after they have slept on the matter and after they have had time to consider it, will rectify some of the errors they have made. You are soon going to have an opportunity to do that. This would mean that the bill, after all the consideration that has been given to it, is now going to be cast aside without consideration. Certainly that is not admissible. If you want to offer a motion to recommit, do so after we have had every opportunity to correct the bill, and then let the House pass upon it. But to do it now would put the Committee on Banking and Currency in a position in which they could not render any service, and it would cause the death not only of price control and wage control but of allocations and priorities which are so essential to the conduct of our defense effort. Certainly you do not want to do that. I ask that you vote this motion down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EBERHARTER) there were—ayes 42, noes 132.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks prior to the Eberharter amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 69, noes 119.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 125, noes 103.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHEELER and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 144, noes, 113.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

(The balance of the bill reads as follows:)

SEC. 202. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p) Consistent with the other provisions of this Act, all affected agencies, departments, and establishments of the Federal Government shall, by July 15, 1952, establish and administer rents and service charges for quarters supplied to Federal employees and members of the Uniformed Services furnished quarters on a rental basis in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Bureau of the Budget."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto conclude at 2:30.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many amendments are at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that there are now 5 amendments at the desk.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Why does not the gentleman make it 2:45?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto conclude not later than 2:45.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to H. R. 8210 offered by Mr. McDONOUGH: Page 12, after line 5, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) Subsection (1) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: '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 (1), (2), and (3) 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, or with respect to any certification made before the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952'."

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the reading of the amendment the gentleman has offered that it is the same amendment I have at the desk. I shall support the gentleman's amendment and hope it will be adopted by the Committee.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members are not confused insofar as these rent-control amendments are concerned. I will attempt to describe the difference between my amendment and the Wheeler amendment which the Committee has just adopted.

The Wheeler amendment provides that if an area is now a critical defense area his amendment will have no effect so far as changing that situation is concerned; that in any area in the United States that is now under rent control, and it is not a critical defense area, rent control will cease at a certain date, unless the local governing body invokes rent control under existing law by appropriate legislative action.

Insofar as my amendment is concerned, I say that if a local governing body has deconrolled the area by legislative action, it shall not be recontrolled unless the findings of the Defense Mobilizer and the Secretary of Defense, who must make a survey to determine whether it is a critical defense area, are turned over to the local governing body for review. If the local governing body finds that the conditions exist as the result of a survey made by these two Federal agencies, that they in fact exist, then the local governing body will by affirmative vote agree with the Federal Government that rent control should apply. If, on the other hand, the local governing body finds that the conditions the Federal agency investigating that area determine are not true, and take negative action, the certification of that area as a critical defense area shall have no force and effect.

There are three things that are necessary to determine whether an area is critical or not: If a new plant or installation has been built in the area, and there is a substantial in-migration of defense workers, or military personnel is required to carry out the activities of such plant or installation, and that there is a substantial shortage of housing to house the defense workers or military personnel. All three of these things must be found in any area that is not now a critical defense area before it can be determined to be a critical defense area and rent control imposed. The essential difference is that if the local governing body has decontrolled rents, my amendment only applies to those areas that have taken such legislative action.

I think that this gives to the local governing body a right to review the findings, and it gives recognition on the part of the Congress that the local governing body has some responsibility to this area.

In order to inform you what the attitude of the Rent Control Administrator is, during the hearings I asked Mr. Tighe Woods this question. You will find it on page 322 of the hearings:

Mr. McDONOUGH. What do you think of an amendment providing that after the survey is made, it is presented to the local governing body for review?

Mr. WOODS. Actually we have been doing it informally. Such an amendment would not bother me at all.

I do not think it is necessary to go into any more detail on this amendment. I trust that the Members of the Committee fully understand it. It is a further amplification of the question of local governing bodies in relation to rent control, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Chairman, the national defense of our country is not a local matter; it is a Federal matter. Defense areas are defined by the Secretary of Defense in conjunction with the Defense Mobilizer. To turn over to the local authorities the right to say whether or not rents in a critical defense area shall be controlled, it seems to me, would be very ill-advised. I understand that is just what the gentleman's amendment does. That amendment, my recollection is, was submitted to the committee and was rejected. It certainly would weaken our defense and weaken the measures we take for our own protection if we turn over to each local community the discretion in regard to these matters.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Could the gentleman tell me how it would work, for instance, in Los Angeles? If in one particular section of the city there was an acute shortage, because of the defense program, would it apply to the entire city?

Mr. SPENCE. The local authorities can decontrol now if they want to.

Mr. POULSON. I mean, in a defense area. The city of Los Angeles has decontrolled rents. But, let us assume there was one particular area where there was an acute need because of the defense program, and they would certify that in that particular area there should be rent control. Would that affect the entire city or not?

Mr. SPENCE. No. The critical area is defined by the authorities that are charged with its definition. The critical area would be confined to that part which was designated as a critical area by Government authority. The local authorities have the right to decontrol as they please the entire city or any part of it.

Mr. MULTER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that the local-option principles of the present rent-control law are desirable and in keeping with our American democratic tradition. However, with equal sincerity and conviction I believe that it would be a great mistake to give the local governing body a veto over the initial introduction of rent control into a critical defense-housing area.

In these critical areas, the Federal Government—not the local government—is responsible for the acute housing situation and the pressure on rents. The Federal Government has established the military installations, and has directed the men who are stationed at these installations. The construction and expansion of defense production plants are the direct effect of defense orders which the Federal Government has placed. For these reasons the Federal Government has a responsibility which it cannot evade, to provide—at least initially—protection to servicemen and defense workers against exorbitant rents.

Actually, in most of these areas, only the Federal Government is able to clearly evaluate the need for rent control at the beginning. This is not because Federal officials are any wiser than local officials, but because only the Federal Government has the full information upon which the decision to certify the locality as a critical area was based. Much of this information must remain classified for security purposes, and cannot be divulged to the general public or to the mayors and members of our elected city councils. In the course of time, the plans which are reflected in this classified information come into actuality, and their actual effect upon the local housing situation becomes clear to the people in the community. If, at this point, it appears that the Federal Government has miscalculated on the effect which the activation of its military installations or the construction of defense plants would have on the housing situation in the community, the governing body of the community will realize the mistake. If it finds that rent control actually is not necessary, it then has ample authority under the present legislation to remove it.

It may be argued that members of the Armed Forces and their families would be protected. Quite the contrary is true because landlords generally would not rent to a member of the Armed Forces and thereby subject their property to rent control when other properties are not under control. If a landlord rents to a soldier he might later be subject to rent control, but if he did not rent to a soldier there is always the possibility that the city council would override any determination by the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Defense Mobilization.

For these reasons, I urge that there be no local veto of the introduction of rent control in a critical area. I believe the local option decontrol provision in the present law is not only sufficient, but provides a much sounder basis for a local determination. The amendment proposed by the Congressman from California should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in behalf of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in line with the question of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] in which he stated that the military authorities or those who have the power to designate a critical area could take in the whole city of Los Angeles, just because a little section was designated a defense area, it seems to me we certainly should have some method by which the governing body within the city would have the right to decontrol certain portions of the city if they did take the whole city. Assume that because they take one area they say the whole city of Los Angeles is a defense area. Anybody who has been out there knows that would be about as silly and ridiculous a thing as you could do, but we know they do those things.

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

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

Mr. MULTER. I understood the chairman of our committee to tell the gentleman in answer to his question that that supposition could not happen.

Mr. POULSON. Yes, but the question is how they can define it. It is still within the city. That is his opinion, but I should like to have some protection for the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. MULTER. You have the protection in the law which now gives you the right to decontrol. Los Angeles is decontrolled and has the right to decontrol. You do not need this amendment to continue that right.

Mr. POULSON. Yes, but suppose they declare the whole city a critical area?

The reason I was in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] was that I am, naturally, going to vote against the whole bill, but I thought this was just as good a time to finish it up as it would be later on. What I predict right now is that we who are opposed to this type of control, which is not getting any results but merely creates this large bureaucracy, will find this is what will happen. We think we are making headway, but the committee will go into conference and they will be in disagreement up until about the last day or two before the recess or adjournment. Then they will come back in the usual method and say ,"We cannot agree, so let us have a continuing resolution." That will leave this Price Control Act, this monstrosity with all its evils, in effect. So I say, let us settle it right now.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how many amendments there are on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed there are three amendments at the desk. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], now have amendments at the desk.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I suggest that in order that the Members offering the amendments may have at least 5 minutes each on their amendments they be recognized for the purpose of offering their amendments. It might complicate the situation, but it will be in lieu of cutting off debate on this amendment or on the amendments as they come up. Would that be agreeable?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman knows time has been fixed for debate to close at 2:45. The gentleman might ask unanimous consent that out of the time remaining these three gentleman who have amendments to offer be allotted 5 minutes apiece to explain their amendments.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I make that request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YORTY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, would that mean they would be recognized now?

The CHAIRMAN. They would not be recognized until the pending amendment is disposed of, but the Chair would retain for them 5 minutes apiece.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Wheeler amendment.

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

There was no objection.

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THE AMENDMENT WHICH WOULD CAUSE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SOLDIERS

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

Mr. Chairman, there probably is not any place in the United States where the battle over rent control has been fought out as it has been in the city of Los Angeles. I certainly do not blame the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] for interesting himself in this problem. But I want to call to your attention what you are doing if you vote for this amendment. The last two sentences of this amendment provide that it will not apply to housing occupied by soldiers or their families where the soldier is stationed nearby. Therefore, this amendment should be called the amendment to rent no more houses to soldiers in areas that are not now controlled, but which may be in the future if they become critical defense areas.

Under this amendment if a defense area is declared impacted because of defense activity, and the local body reviews the Federal decision and decides against controls, then control will be applied only to houses occupied by soldiers or their families. What person offering a house for rent in an uncontrolled area would rent that house to a soldier from this date forward if we adopt this amendment? I remember when I came home I had a lot of trouble getting into my own house. It is very difficult for soldiers sometimes. This amendment does not even purport to take care of the families of veterans if the veterans are overseas. It only makes provision that control may be placed on housing where a veteran is stationed nearby. I cannot understand the kind of reasoning that puts that sort of wording into an amendment and asks the House of Representatives to vote against the soldiers of this country and against their families by practically barring them from the opportunity to rent houses.

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

Mr. YORTY. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Would the gentleman say that the amendment should apply to the armed services, and if the local governing body says that there shall be no rent control there, that the soldiers in that area shall be under rent control? Mr. YORTY, I can see where you are attempting to say that this is discrimination against members of the armed services, which is not my intention. My intention is to protect members of the Armed Forces. The House legislative counsel may have made a mistake in drafting the amendment.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I yielded to the gentleman only for a question. Let me say to the gentleman, I am not making a theoretical argument. I am making a factual, legal argument. I believe the gentleman should again study the last two sentences of his amendment. In my opinion, the legislative counsel has not properly considered the effect of the last part of the amendment as it would apply to members of the armed services. What it does is to say that this amendment does not apply to housing occupied by soldiers if they are stationed nearby, or housing occupied by their families if the soldiers are stationed nearby. If a soldier is in Korea it does not even purport to protect his family. Only if a soldier is stationed at home on duty nearby is he supposed to be protected by this amendment construed in the most favorable way. I say again, and I repeat, and it cannot be refuted, that this is an antisoldier amendment because no person will rent to a soldier in the future if there is a chance that the area might be controlled and applied only to people who rent to soldiers. It would definitely cause discrimination against members of the armed services who desire to rent houses in areas not now under control.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking the author of this amendment some questions.

Do I understand that this amendment applies in those areas that have heretofore been decontrolled, and thereafter the National Government determines that this is a critical area, and that after the National Government determines it is a critical area you must have the concurrence of the local council in order to make rent controls effective?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right. In other words, the local governing body has to make an affirmative finding that the findings of the Federal Government as they have found them are correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. You could and would visualize that in some instances in those areas that have been decontrolled and the National Government finds it is a critical area, before rent control can become effective, the local authorities must also enter into the same findings in order to have rent control?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I also understand that your amendment goes further and says that it shall not apply to a man in the Armed Forces stationed nearby. Is that correct?

Mr. McDONOUGH. The last two sentences of the amendment read that it shall not apply to housing accommodations occupied by the family of a member of the armed services who is stationed at an armed services installation adjacent to the locality. That has reference to camps in the immediate area.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then I understand that in order for it to be effective the National Government and the local government must approve it; and if they do approve it, then it shall apply to the Armed Forces.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is correct. It shall not apply to the Armed Forces and their families.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Shall not apply to the Armed Forces?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right. If they say that rent controls shall go into effect, it shall apply to the Armed Forces. If they say it shall not go into effect, it shall not apply to the Armed Forces.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then if they do not both concur, you have no rent control as it deals with the Armed Forces stationed in that area?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Except whatever control may be under the Government itself on those Army installations.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Of course, in the installation owned by the Government itself they have control of that, but I am talking of areas outside of Government ownership.

Now, if you have a decontrol situation, it has already been decontrolled, in order for your amendment to become effective in critical areas, then who, under your amendment, would administer the terms and conditions of the rent control, and what would it be?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Of course, if the local government determines that the Federal findings are not according to their findings, there is no rent control applied. If they find that they are, then rent control is applied; but if it is applied, it does not apply to any Army personnel stationed in Army installations in that adjacent locality.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then the Federal Government Rent Control Office would be in force and effect and would be reestablished, if you had a

combination of the National Government in a critical area and the local government concurred in their findings?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is correct.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a substitute to my own amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may withdraw his amendment and modify it, if he desires to do so.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I withdraw the amendment and will offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDONOUGH: On page 12, following line 5, add another section as follows:

"SEC. — Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(q) Except in the case of action taken after full compliance with subsection (k) of this section, the President shall not reestablish maximum rents in any locality which has previously been decontrolled under this act until a public hearing, after 30 days' notice, has been held in such locality, and the governing body of said locality has by resolution, adopted in accordance with applicable local law, found that the conditions set forth in subsection (1) exist in said locality'."

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment. I recognized the possibility of misconstruing the last section of the amendment I originally offered insofar as the armed services are concerned.

I have five sons who are veterans of World War II. My oldest son is at present in the Armed Forces and a Korean veteran.

I would never discriminate against or provide any means whereby the members of the armed services and their families would be discriminated against.

The language referring to the Armed Forces and their families was inserted by the House legislative counsel and since it might be misconstrued to be discriminatory I have removed it in my substitute amendment.

This amendment as proposed will merely provide for a review of the findings of the Federal Government and to determine whether those findings are in accordance with the facts and then take affirmative or negative action.

If there is any doubt in the minds of those who had the idea that the last section of my first amendment would discriminate against the armed services, I have by this amendment removed that section and I want the RECORD to show that it was never my intention regardless of any remarks to the contrary by my colleague from California [Mr. YORTY]—that there was any desire on my part to discriminate against the members of the armed services and their families, but rather to protect them against decontrol in the immediate area where they may be living in an armed services installation in an area that is not declared critical by the local governing body and consequently would not be under rent control.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McDONOUGH) there were—ayes 39, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: At page 12 of H. R. 8210, add the following after line 5:

"SEC. 302. The Director of Defense Mobilization is hereby authorized to appoint a Defense Areas Advisory Committee to advise him in connection with the exercise of any function or authority vested in him by section 204 (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, or section 101 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, or by delegation thereunder, with respect to determining any area to be a critical defense housing area. Any committee so appointed shall consist, in addition to a chairman, of representatives of the Department of Defense, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Office of Rent Stabilization. Any Federal agency shall, to the fullest practicable extent, furnish such information in its possession to the Defense Areas Advisory Committee as such committee may request from time to time relevant to its operations."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this merely sets up an advisory committee to help the Director of Defense Mobilization to reach a proper determination in connection with the defense areas. I understand the agencies involved have no objection to it, and at least some of the members of the committee on the other side have indicated that they have no objection to it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. Chairman, I might say that my opposition to the amendment is quite qualified. There probably is not very much reason why it should not be agreed to. However, I want to take this time to talk on other matters.

Mr. Chairman, before we close debate on this bill we should bear in mind that there is a school of thought here in the Committee of the Whole that through the exercise of some very smart tactics, which are political in nature, if this bill is made too ineffective according to the standards of certain administrators of the act, then those who have done this will find themselves in very serious political straits come next October and November. Because those statements have been made I think the counterstatement should also be made that it is obviously within the province of the administration, if it sees fit to do so, to increase prices. This may be done in several ways. It may be done, as Mr. Arnall and Mr. Putnam have tried to do in weeks gone by, by throwing out scarce propaganda which impels the people against the possibility of rising prices to turn their money into commodities. That has been done and prices can be increased in that manner. Also the Commodity Credit Corporation can go on a buying spree and force the price of any commodity up almost as high as it wants to by accumulating in its warehouses huge and unnecessarily large stocks of goods. This is also true of the Defense Department and the other procurement agencies of the Government.

May I say to you that under the present circumstances and in the foreseeable future if prices do rise in the United States it will be because of the deliberate actions taken by the administration to put this House and the Congress in the embarrasing position of not having gone along with it on price control. Do not be frightened. If we cannot take care of ourselves in that situation, then we do not deserve to be here in this Congress. Inflation cannot be stopped by direct price controls alone, but prices can be maintained at a high level by the manipulation of the commodity markets by the agencies of Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes 58, noes 22.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: On page 12, line 5, after "budget", strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to housing units under the jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission where Federal rent control is now in effect."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: On page 12, after line 5, insert a new section as follows:

"Section — subsection (1) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 as amended, is amended by striking out paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following paragraph:

"'1. A new defense plant or installation has been provided or an existing defense plant or installation has been reactivated or its operations substantially expanded;

"'2. Substantial immigration of defense workers of military personnel has occurred to carry out activities at such plant or installation;

"'3. Substantial shortage of housing required for such defense workers of military personnel exists which has resulted in excessive rent increases and which impedes activities of such defense plant or installation'."

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, last year Lorain, Ohio, was declared a critical defense-housing area. At the same time they imposed rent control on the area they took in a number of smaller communities, including some rural areas, that had no need for rent control at all.

All my amendment does is to differentiate properly between the conditions for certification as a critical area under the

Defense Housing Act, and conditions for certification as critical under the Housing and Rent Act.

At present these conditions are substantially the same, yet the objectives are far apart.

The conditions for certification of a critical defense-housing area under the Defense Housing Act must necessarily look to the future; that a military installation is to be reactivated, a substantial inmigration of personnel will be required, and a substantial shortage of housing impends. This is necessary because the object of the Defense Housing Act is to construct housing that would be ready for occupancy at some future date when the area would sustain the impact of increased defense activity.

However, rent control deals with a situation in the present, and therefore the conditions for certification of a critical defense area under the Rent Act should deal in the present.

For example, under the present law the President may impose full Federal rent control in an area which may sustain substantial immigration of defense workers at some future date and which would result in a threat of excessive rent increases. There is no basis whatsoever for providing such broad authority to impose rent control because of a future need. Particularly, is this so when we realize that when an area is certified for rent control, the rents may be rolled back 6 months, a year or all the way back to June 24, 1950.

In effect, the amendment would prevent a premature designation of an area as critical for full Federal rent control, yet would not affect the maximum rent or the roll-back date once the area is certified to meet an actual existing situation.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the committee will adopt the amendment.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. As I understand the amendment it would prevent a critical defense area from being designated until the workers or the soldiers were in that area; is that true?

Mr. AYRES. No, that is not true at all. For instance, in the Lorain situation which was declared a critical defense area, if they do not get the steel strike settled pretty soon there will not be any need for calling it a critical defense area.

Mr. SPENCE. As I understand the amendment, at the time the area would be declared a critical defense area, controls would be placed on housing.

Mr. AYRES. All my amendment does is to separate the two, and say two decisions have to be made and not one.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes 87, noes 61.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if the Talle amendment had been limited to its first half, decontrolling any material that has been selling below ceiling price for 3 months, I would have voted for it. There ought to be specific rules laid down requiring orderly decontrol by OPS when the criteria are met—and that is a fair and reasonable one.

But the second yardstick in the Talle amendment, namely, mandatory suspension of ceiling price for any material in adequate or surplus supply, and judged to be in adequate or surplus supply if not rationed—is unwise, in my opinion. It would either compel rationing, which I do not favor, or permit prices to rise above ceilings without limit. This is a price control bill, and while I support amendments to make sure that the ceilings OPS establishes are fair and will not discourage production because production is the main answer to rising prices, I believe it is unwise to remove ceilings entirely except when the ceiling was proved unnecessary by the material selling below the ceiling.

So I am compelled to vote against the Talle amendment in its present form because of the second criterion established. If the amendment is adopted, I hope it will be revised in conference.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep apprehension that I have watched the action of this House in deliberately and systematically decimating our economic controls. Although I fully realize that certain changes in the present structure and scope of these controls are warranted by the change in economic conditions, I am gravely perturbed by the adoption of the numerous amendments which have crippled this legislation to the point where it is now a mere skeleton of its former self—a skeleton with which the Government is supposed to maintain the economic stability of our Nation.

The argument has been repeatedly advanced while the bill has been under consideration, that the need for economic controls has disappeared. Now, there are two ways, it would appear to me, of looking at this question. On one hand, there are people who feel that controls, with their requirements, are burdensome, and that it would be politically expedient to remove them. It is that kind of thinking that prevailed in Congress in 1946, when all price controls were suddenly removed with the assurance that prices would soon level off and decline. The opposite, however, proved to be the case, and there are very few consumers who will ever forget the hardships of inflationary pressures which were released on the public as a result of hasty congressional action.

The other way of looking at this question consists of judging hard, practical facts, and having some concern for the average wage earner and taxpayer, to whom every increase in prices brings additional hardships. It is from this viewpoint that the advisability of maintaining economic controls should be determined.

Let us look at some plain facts. The Members who voted to cripple economic controls pointed out, for instance, that the general level of prices has leveled off and is relatively stable. This condition prevailed, however, only for a brief period during the early part of the year. The past few months, in contrast, have witnessed a steady and continued increase in the cost of living. The indexes compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that, since a drop last February, prices have been steadily going up, and are today only one-tenth of 1 percent below the all-time peak reached in January.

The argument was also raised that many goods are presently in plentiful supply, some of them selling below price ceilings. With this assertion I have no quarrel to pick. But if one looks a bit deeper than just the surface, we must come to the realization that our defense program, which largely affects the available supply of goods and their prices, is still increasing in volume. It is estimated that defense expenditures will amount this coming fiscal year to $60,000,000,000. This tremendous influx of money into our economy cannot pass by without an inflationary effect on the average, day-to-day cost of living.

All these factors, and many others which were brought out during the debate, point to the fact that the economic state of the Nation is not as yet stable, and can be very easily thrown out of balance to the detriment of the consumers and the Nation as a whole.

It should also be remembered that the abolition of a large part of the structure of our present economic-stabilization program, envisaged in the present form of the legislation before this House, will preclude the possibility of maintaining a close and accurate check on the economic changes occurring in our Nation, which may require prompt remedial action. In addition, the proposed abolition of the Wage Stabilization Board, which in my opinion should remain tripartite in nature, constitutes but another attempt to cripple or invalidate the presently set up stabilization process.

In view of the above-mentioned factors—namely, the continuing increase in the cost of living; the anticipated $60,000,000,000 outlay for defense during fiscal 1953; and the lack of adequate evidence of economic stability—it would appear to me that the crippling of economic controls, so as to make them completely ineffectual, is unwise at the present time; further a failure to provide preventive checks that could be invoked promptly, is foolhardy.

THE NEED FOR CONTINUING PRICE CONTROLS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, we, the representatives of the people of the United States, must recognize that it is imperative during this time of emergency to continue price controls as they have been established under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. The threat of inflation and the resultant

danger to our national economy and defense effort is as prevalent today as it has been at any time during the past 2 years.

We often hear it said that the Federal Government should cut down expenditures in the interest of economy. But there would be no gain realized by cutting down expenditures if, at the same time, the Members of Congress in one short-sighted moment allowed the evils of inflation to befall our Nation as a result of lifting price controls and if the necessary quantity of goods and services so desperately needed for the defense effort were further reduced by increasing prices.

The facts seem to indicate clearly that price controls have been very effective in diminishing the fires of inflation, for in the 15 months prior to establishment of price controls in January 1951 the consumers' price index increased by 7.7 percent, and in the short span of 6 months following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea this index increased by 6.6 percent. In the 15 months following establishment of price controls the consumers' price index has increased by only 3.9 percent.

In little more realistic terms, these figures simply mean that the increases in prices in the 15 months prior to the establishment of price controls decreased the value of the dollar in terms of the 1939 purchasing power by 4 cents, and in the 15 months since price controls were instituted the purchasing power of the dollar has decreased by only 2 cents.

Shakespeare once said, "What is past is prologue." Yes, the past is merely an introduction—a beginning—and we should grow as a result of what has happened in the past and should be in a position to face the future more intelligently. The situation that resulted from our unwisely lifting of price controls after the Second World War in the face of similar inflationary pressures should be lesson enough to show us the way for the future.

Mr. Bernard Baruch got to the heart of this whole question of continuing price controls in a single sentence in his letter to Senator BLAIR MOODY, Democrat, of Michigan. "It is a question," wrote Mr. Baruch, "of which is to be put first, the national interest or the special interest." It is our obligation as representatives of the people of the United States to act in their best interest for we and they are the roots from which democracy must draw its life. If we do our share, as Mr. Baruch has said, considering only the national interest and not the special interest, it becomes obvious that price controls should be continued.

In conclusion it must be noted that the removal of price controls at this time would have the following possible effects:

First. Uncontrolled inflation with a resultant decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar because the total demand for goods and services for consumer consumption is greater than their supply.

Second. Inflated dollars would mean that the Government would have to expend more money to get the same quantity of goods and services needed for defense.

Third. The Government's increased spending would have to be financed by larger taxes or increased deficit spending.

Fourth. The lower and middle income groups would be forced to live on a relatively lower level because of higher prices.

Fifth. Fixed income pensions and institutions would be squeezed by the pressure of depreciated purchasing power of their income.

Mr. Chairman, the voices raised most earnestly in behalf of retention of controls and holding the line against each and every special interest comes from no one political party and no one economic level. It is the voice of the American people demanding a workable and effective Defense Production Act that can successfully do the job for which it has been designed.

It is true that nobody likes to take unpalatable medicines. Yet when the family doctor orders the patient to do so, in order to combat illness or disorder, the patient usually does so. If not, he suffers the consequences.

I think we should view controls in the same light. Nobody likes them. However, as undesirable as controls are, they pose less of a peril to a free economy than does the near confiscation of uncontrolled inflation which can be disastrous or ruinous to our economy. Controls are the necessary medicines with which to combat inflation. All of us are aware of what inflation can do when it is allowed to run rampant through a nation. We have too many examples in history of this terrifying and destructive power. We caught a glimpse of this power after the United States went into war in Korea and prices soared from day to day and from hour to hour.

In this time of emergency the question which is squarely put to us is this: What is to come first, the national interest or the special interest?

If we are to maintain a stabilized economy, one that will not explode in our faces and wreck the whole country at a time of crisis, we must adopt an effective measure of control. That challenge is ours now. In the interest of our people, in the interest of our economy, in the interest of our national security, I shall vote against any and all amendments that will cripple and make ineffective the Defense Production Act which we are now considering.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, under the permission granted to extend my remarks at this point, I desire to include the following article from the New York Times of yesterday:

STEEL AGREEMENT REACHED, DROPPED—BETHLEHEM AND UNION EFFECT ACCORD WITH MODIFIED UNION SHOP—INDUSTRY REJECTS IT

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, June 24.—The Bethlehem Steel Co. and the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, reached an understanding last week that would have ended the steel strike, but the deal was subject to the approval of other major steel companies and they, or a majority of them, refused to go along.

Well-placed industry sources said the understanding covered the two remaining major issues blocking a settlement of the 23-day-old steel strike—the union shop and back pay. They described the union-shop compromise as a modification of the principle that requires all employees to become members of the union within 30 days after their employment begins. Steel union officials declined to comment.

Other aspects of the steel story today were:

A project to reopen certain mills for the production of top priority military material apparently has failed.

The Senate Labor Committee approved two plant-seizure bills but the Democratic policy committee decided not to put them on the calendar for consideration in view of recent Senate rejections of similar proposals.

The understanding between Bethlehem and the union was reached at an informal meeting last Thursday in New York. The Bethlehem officials reported this to a meeting of steel industry leaders on Friday. The industry turned it down. Bethlehem, in accordance with a kind of compact, or gentlemen's agreement, that binds the steel companies, bowed to this decision, and talks with the union were broken off.

The understanding, it was reported, would have given the employees more back pay than the offer made by the companies in Washington 2 weeks ago. The objections of the industry, however, were grounded on the union-shop compromise and not on the back-pay proposal.

The veto strength was exercised largely by United States Steel, Inland, National, and Armco. The last two companies are only partly affected by the strike. Some of their units, which have independent unions or are unorganized, are producing steel.

Republic Steel and Jones & Laughlin stood with the group but they are believed to be more amenable to compromising the union-shop issue than the others are at this time.

Two weeks ago, just before the collapse of bargaining in Washington, Republic was reported to be out in front in the union-shop negotiations, but backed away under pressure from United States Steel, it was said.

Bethlehem was the first to settle with the union 2 years ago. There was some kind of understanding among the steel companies at that time, too, although it was not believed to be as tight as the current compact. Anyhow, the Bethlehem settlement became the industry pattern.

VARIOUS FACTORS IN DEADLOCK

The impasse in the steel negotiations probably cannot be ascribed to any single factor. It is the belief of many informed persons that the large supplies of some types of steel is the major influence in the companies' decision and that when these inventories are reduced a price increase will be more meaningful and bargaining will be conducted on a more realistic basis.

Likewise, as the steelworkers feel the pinch of payless paydays more and more the union becomes more amenable to compromise.

The possibility that President Truman may have to use the Taft-Hartley law against the union to restore production and possibly will invoke it Thursday, also may figure in the industry's calculations to some extent.

Resistance to compulsory unionism on grounds of principle varies in strength among employers generally and this is true within the steel industry. Clarence B. Randall, president of Inland, is probably the most articulate of the steel employers who oppose the union shop on moral grounds. The fact that Inland once made a union-shop agreement in its coal mines is not regarded by Mr. Randall as a refutation or contradiction of his position. He feels that the coal-mine contract was something the

company had to take and did not agree to voluntarily.

Other steel employers, while believing that union membership should be held to a voluntary basis, say privately that they probably would conform to the prevailing practice.

When the Washington talks were called off about 2 weeks ago, both sides announced they were willing to produce steel for essential armaments. They appointed committees, which met with defense production officials several times, but so far the Government has not designated a single plant for reopening on an emergency basis.

The project apparently involved so many technical problems, as well as labor-management bargaining problems, that it is not going to yield much if anything. The union concedes that it is reluctant to send some of its members back to work in an area where other members would continue striking.

The industry and the Government, for their part, seem unwilling even to ventilate the problems involved.

The seizure bills, which were pigeonholed almost as fast as they were reported out of committee today, were sponsored by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Republican, of Oregon.

The Humphrey bill was tailored specially for the current steel dispute to provide for just compensation for both sides. It would not permit the Government to impose the union shop. The committee also proposed another bill offered by Senator HUMPHREY providing for the establishment for a labor-management study.

The Morse bill would give the President a flexible set of tools, including seizure and an injunction to use whenever the national security was threatened by a labor-management dispute.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I find it necessary to cast my vote against final passage of the Defense Production Act now before us. Previous to this vote, I have voted against the crippling amendments offered by various Congressmen which have been included in the bill.

In my opinion, the Defense Production Act as it now comes before us, is a spineless, useless measure which betrays the American people and which would undermine our defense program as well as the Nation's economy. I cannot conscientiously vote for it. It is a control bill in name only; it utterly destroys controls and paves the way for skyrocketing prices, profiteering, increased living costs, and terrible hardships for the American people to bear. It protects special interests and those who stand to make huge profits when controls are removed; it is a boon to those who seek unconscionable gains even though it means jeopardizing our freedom.

This so-called control bill makes our people defenseless against those who have now been given the go sign to charge outrageous prices for food and other necessities of life; it throws them to the wolves of greed and selfishness. At the same time the wage freeze is extended so that most people will find it impossible to meet the further increased living costs. Their wages remain the same while costs boom upward. This is a shocking and conscienceless act, and I want no part of it.

The American people looked to Congress for protection and help in these days of spiraling living costs. Furthermore, they expected us to prevent further inflation in order that our Nation's economy would remain safely stabilized. The terrific inflation which is now bound to come will prove disastrous; we will destroy ourselves as surely as any enemy could, for when our economy is dangerously undermined, our Nation stands defeated.

The crippling amendments which have been adopted and which so seriously destroy the effectiveness of this control measure have made this a no-control measure. For these reasons, I am voting against it.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, my vote against this miscalled price-control bill is a protest against what I regard as a fraud on the people of the United States. This bill as amended by the coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats is no longer a price-control bill. The people should not be misled into thinking that it is a control bill. It is, as it now stands, a decontrol bill. It will remove controls from items which already are so high that people are rightfully complaining. Another price spiral would do untold damage to our economy and perhaps completely wreck our defense effort. Prices which skyrocketed before controls were instituted cost us thousands of planes, tanks, and ships, for which the sums appropriated turned out to be insufficient. We cannot permit this to happen again by passing a watered-down fraudulent price-control bill in our haste to adjourn. We have time to do the job right, and it is our duty to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I detest controls, their bureaucracy, red tape, and all the annoyance that goes with them. But what is the alternative at a time like this? Defense expenditures will be larger during the ensuing months than heretofore. Huge defense payrolls will give consumers more funds, but not more consumer goods. The inflationary pressure on prices which will result must be held down by price control. I wish there were some other way, but there is not. Under these circumstances, this decontrol bill is a threat to our economy. The original bill reported by the committee remains in name only. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has described the coalition which riddled this bill by amendments as being "drunk with power." I believe that power has been used against the best interests of the Nation. Perhaps a House-Senate conference committee can repair the damage enough to make the bill workable, but as the bill now stands it is an unjustified attempt to lift the lid and let inflation rob our people of their savings and earnings.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, of course we must all vote for passage of this bill for one reason: that is the only way it can go to conference where there may be a possibility of getting a better bill. In its present form, the bill is a betrayal of the consumer and the American public.

It is with the greatest reluctance that I shall vote for passage. I must do so only in the hope that the conference committee may change it so we have controls.

In other words, a vote for passage is not a vote for this bill. It is only a vote to send it to conference where a better bill may be worked out. That will give us the opportunity in a couple of days to vote either for or against the conference report.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I have long felt that the only answer to inflation is controls. That opinion has been justified by the rising costs of food, clothing, and the necessaries of life. These rises have been occasioned because of the limited legislation that we have adopted in our struggle against inflationary prices. The original bill, as reported by the committee, would have been a great factor in stabilizing our economy. However, the many amendments that have been adopted to this measure in the last few days, have merely placed wages in a strait-jacket and given carte blanche to those who have been making profit out of consumers' goods.

Having consistently voted against the crippling amendments to the bill, I now find myself, along with many of my distinguished colleagues, in the position that it is necessary to cast my vote against final passage of the Defense Production Act. It is not a control bill, except in name. It, in effect, destroys controls and opens the way to increased living costs.

The provision providing for a wage freeze puts the employee into the position of having his wages remain the same while prices go steadily upward.

Reference to invoking the Taft-Hartley law is further evidence that this bill is, in truth, an antilabor measure. Hence I cannot, and will not, vote for passage of the bill.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I am vigorously opposed to the attempts being made here to completely remove every reasonable economic regulation from the existing Defense Production Act. The paramount domestic problem facing the Nation now is to prevent the collapse of our economic stability from the ruinous ravages of threatening, runaway inflationary pressures. The eyes of all the American taxpayers are focused on us today to observe our determination to legislate wisely for the general welfare or surrender to the persuasive lobbying tactics of special groups. I earnestly hope this House will act for the common interest of all the people, without political partisanship or misplaced confidence in the extravagant cries of selfish-seeking organizations.

Under ordinary living conditions I would be the first to protest against the imposition of any controlled economy but will any person dare say we are living under normal circumstances today? In the complex economic turmoil surrounding American life now I am deeply and gravely apprehensive of the disastrous effects which would most surely seem to follow any full elimination of the sensible control safeguards presently protecting our economic structure. I earnestly believe the removal of all price controls

at this time would inevitably lead to these chief crippling results:

First. Uncontrolled inflation with a resultant decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar because the total demand for goods and services for consumer consumption is greater than their supply.

Second. Inflated dollars would mean that the Government would have to expend more money to get the same quantity of goods and services needed for defense.

Third. The Government's increased spending would have to be financed by larger taxes or increased deficit spending.

Fourth. The lower- and middle-income groups would be forced to live on a relatively lower level because of higher prices.

Fifth. Fixed-income pensions and institutions would be squeezed by the pressure of depreciated purchasing power of their income.

The average American taxpayer and wage earner well remembers what happened back in 1946 when all price controls were suddenly removed, with the naive assurance that prices would soon level off and decline. Just the opposite proved to be the case, and few consumers will ever forget the hardships thrust on the buying public by that hasty congressional action. Our experience right after World War II should be lesson enough to convince us of our duty to protect the American housewife and wage earner from another morale-demoralizing price-gouging era.

The plain facts existing today point to the truth that the economic state of this country is not yet soundly stable and can be very easily thrown out of balance to the detriment of the consumers and the national welfare as a whole. The indexes compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that, since a drop last February, prices have been steadily going up and are right now only one-tenth of 1 percent below the all-time peak reached in January of 1951. The continuing increase in the cost of living necessities; the anticipated $60,000,000,000 outlay for defense spending in fiscal 1953 with the accompanying effect on the supply of goods for civilian use; the lack of any real evidence proving our basic economy will remain stable convinces me the failure to provide preventive inflationary checks now is practically unwise and an invitation to economic disaster.

Mr. Chairman, in this time of great emergency when the Communist leaders are deliberately and admittedly trying to promote disunion and demoralization among the people of the United States we have only one challenge squarely facing the Members of this House. Are we going to legislate wisely for the general welfare of the country or are we going to further the selfish objectives of a few organized groups? The question is simple and our answer should be clear, in voting to maintain a reasonable system of price controls for the protection of the great majority of our citizens, the wage earners and their families. I earnestly hope the Senate and the conference committee will demand and insist that the retention of sensible price controlling machinery is vitally essential to our continuing economic stability while we are engaged in this desperate struggle for survival against the Godless Communist leaders seeking to destroy us from within and without.

Mr. Chairman, I also feel in duty bound to speak against the attempts to legislate on gravely important national problems by hasty amendment actions when the Congress is rushing toward a deadline of adjournment, either temporary or permanent. This is not the temperate, unprejudiced atmosphere in which to calmly deliberate on such nationally important problems as the application of the Taft-Hartley law provisions to the steel production difficulty, the abolition of the Wage Stabilization Board and the decimation of the Housing and Rent Control Act. These are matters that deeply affect the welfare and morale of the whole country. They demand long, careful, unpassioned legislative exploration for decisions of wisdom in solution. Until the overpublicized steel dispute the Wage Stabilization Board possessed an excellent record of helping to equitably settle many vexing labor and management differences to the acceptance of both sides. A summary dissolution of this Board, which in my conviction should remain tripartite in nature, would prove to be ill-advised at this time. The hurried and exciting efforts here to pressure the President into forceful use of the injunctive penalties of the Taft-Hartley Act against the steelworkers is a regrettable punitive gesture in this hour of serious threat to our national security.

That suggestion is obviously against the full sense of American justice when we reflect the steelworkers themselves voluntarily refrained from walking off their jobs, as they were legally entitled to do the moment the contract expired, and stayed at their work of producing steel for 150 days. To say the least it is indeed questionable common sense to destroy and discourage the spirit and will of management and labor to continue to resolve their honest differences by the orderly processes of real, genuine collective bargaining without unwarranted Government interference, of imperialistic directive. In the last analysis the responsibility of insuring the public safety is adequately protected by sufficient defense material production belongs to the Congress. We cannot and should not try to evade that obligation to the people we represent by any subterfuge imposition saddled, without any careful or thoughtful examination, on the Chief Executive. Let us remain at work here in the Congress and meet our duty by making a full and complete study to determine the necessity of enacting a fair and balanced seizure law safeguarding the interests of management, labor, and the public, if it becomes imperative to do. This is a problem that should be given separate and concentrated attention. It ought not to be cursorily passed on amidst a jumble of amendments surrounding other legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal to limit rent stabilization to critical defense housing areas has been accorded too little scrutiny to judge its real effect. Unfortunately the significance of the terms "critical" and "noncritical" are not their usual ones when applied to rent-controlled areas. Critical areas are those brought under control because they have experienced sudden population increases of defense workers or military personnel since June of 1950; noncritical areas are those which have not had that unexpected population development. However the so-called noncritical areas are of great importance to our over-all defense program because they include most of our great industrial cities.

In fact, this proposal would be a damaging blow to the general stabilization effort. A majority of our major industrial cities would suddenly find themselves without rent control. Of 106 cities in the United States with 100,000 or more population a total of 52 have ordinary types of noncritical rent control that would be affected by the decontrol action. This amendment would disturb the lives of the one-third of our people who live in cities for which decontrol is proposed.

There are completely adequate guarantees in the present law to assure that the rent-stabilization program will not be unduly prolonged in any area, whether critical or noncritical. The governing body of every municipality, and of every county, has full authority to terminate the rent-stabilization program whenever it finds control is no longer required. The fact that local governing bodies with over 53,000,000 persons in their jurisdiction have refused to exercise their authority under this provision is emphatic proof that most local officials, who know their particular areas best, are firmly convinced the rent-stabilization program is still urgently needed in their own communities.

Mr. Chairman, some great and experienced authorities have declared this period to be the most dangerous in the history of our great Nation. Even without such authoritative warning I believe the average citizen and wage earner realizes full well our very existence and civilization is being threatened by the most devilish and resourceful enemy the world has ever known; certainly the Members of this body understand the Communist military threat as well as their insidious design to incite our people toward class-hatred and group-quarreling. I, therefore, wish to urge and implore my colleagues to calmly and judiciously dwell on the fundamental importance of the action we take here as it affects the national welfare. Sound and wise laws cannot be enacted in a legislative atmosphere of confusion, excitement, and prejudice. I earnestly ask you all to consider long and thoughtfully on the doubtful wisdom of approving any legislation that may well increase antagonisms and divide our people when unity, understanding, cooperation, and good will are so essential to our national-defense effort and the success of the free world in this decisive fight against totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendments to the Defense Production Act offered here today

since they would, in effect, remove controls or weaken them to such extent that they would no longer be effective. I find it necessary to vote against final passage of the bill since I cannot conscientiously give my support to a program designed to undermine the Nation's economy. I am deeply shocked at the action of the House in permitting the price control law to be amended and revised in such manner that it cannot possibly be anything but a control law in name only. In reality, the amendments adopted here today offer a green light signal to the profiteers to impose financial burdens upon the American people who are looking to us to protect them from further increases in the cost of living.

The issue being fought here today is an old one. Carrying the ball for the removal of price controls are those special interests who stand to profit most from high prices. Alined against the special interests are the farmers, wage and salary earners, and housewives, the consumers of the Nation.

The votes cast here today will reveal which side we are on. And I warn the Members of the House that the action taken on this bill will not soon be forgotten by the American public.

The Defense Production Act has had my support consistently. With controls in force we have barely been able to hold the line of the cost of living. I believe, most emphatically, that if we remove all of the reduction of $31,920,000 achieved price controls the flame of inflation will burn higher and higher. That portion of our population who live on annuities and pensions will be faced with disaster. Lower and middle income groups will be forced to a lower standard of living. This bill now before us is but a feeble gesture to extend the present law. It is so badly mangled that if it becomes law it will carry little meaning.

The people of this country look to Congress for protection against spiraling living costs. We cannot let them down. I vote against this bill in protest against its inequities.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, the House has proven today that, in spite of air conditioning, the heat of 102° here in Washington affected a great many. The "coalition" has amended price control out of the law and has tried to use the bill to wreak vengeance on the American wage earner. They have succeeded in so riddling the stabilization program that there is no program left. With each amendment wedged through today they have struck another blow for the price profiteers and another blow at the consumer and the American worker. They have also added billions of dollars to the price we are going to have to pay for defense weapons and to the eventual reckoning when we have to raise the taxes to pay for the defense effort. It may also be that an individual day of reckoning will come sooner than they think for some of our Republican colleagues who have so happily swung the ax. The consumer will have an ax of his own to swing in November and 4 months of higher and higher prices to work up to the point of swinging it in the right direction. Outraged labor will also have its innings then, and so will the tenant whose rent has hit the ceiling between now and November.

It is only by a complete run-down of the amendments tacked on to the Defense Production Act by the House that we get a full picture of the almost incredible disregard for the national stability and safety shown by the Dixie-GOP's. Apparently they set out to do two things: to straitjacket labor and the consumer and to give a clear field to business and agricultural interests for making hay in the sunshine of the Republican smile. What this may do to the defense effort God knows, but seemingly the other side of the aisle is willing to leave it up to the Almighty to take care of that—they have certainly forced the House to abdicate its responsibility in the matter.

Let us note for the record just what we have done to any hope of controlling inflation and keeping production going in these deadly serious times. On the question of labor, wages, and industrial peace we have first the Lucas amendment. Under its terms the Wage Stabilization Board is thrown out the window. With the present set-up of the Board both labor and management were provided with a sensible, workable arrangement under which collective bargaining could be allowed to operate with a minimum of interference—where their representatives had an effective voice in decisions of vital importance to both sides—where the fundamental national policies on labor policies could be hammered out in free discussion among equals—and where irreconciliable disputes could be brought for settlement of all issues without paralyzing the defense effort. The tripartite composition of the Board—with equal representation for industry, labor, and the public—assured at least some of the elements of justice to both sides. Under the Lucas amendment we have a kangaroo court dictating terms, with no effective voice given to either labor or management. The labor and industry members can do no more than plead their special cases. The decisions will not be the result of negotiations between equals, but the unilateral edict of the majority of public members. Wage policies set by this method cannot be realistic. In the limited conditions where the Board may advise on disputes brought before it the collective-bargaining principle has been destroyed. With no authority to offer advice on other than wage issues the procedure becomes a farce. When labor is told, "This will be your maximum wage" and is denied the chance to trade wage concessions for fringe and security benefits it becomes slave labor in a subtle form. Labor will not and cannot willingly submit to such a system. Labor has given up more than its share already in voluntarily submitting to the restrictions placed on its bargaining freedom under the present law. The obvious intent of the supporters of the Lucas amendment is to set up a packed Board sympathetic to industry and unfriendly to labor. I have heard reports that when the Lucas amendment proposals were suggested to former Defense Mobilizer Charles Wilson he was all for them. He was asked what sort of people he thought should be made "public" members of the proposed Board—the majority and dictating group. His reply is supposed to have been, "Why, businessmen, of course." That is a perfect illustration of the kind of "fair" thinking behind the Lucas amendment and an indication of the fairness of the policies it would put out.

The House has ripped out of the act the only means we now have for getting a quick settlement of labor disputes threatening stoppage of defense production. We have put nothing in its place. I suppose that the House's action in adopting the Smith amendment, "requesting" the President to use the Taft-Hartley law procedures in the steel strike, means that we are content to let all disputes ride and leave them up to the "tender mercies" of Taft-Hartley. The House is fooling only itself if it thinks that the steel strike or any other strike will be settled by that means. If we adjourn sine die on July 5 and the President does see fit to request an injunction under the Taft-Hartley law, what happens after the 80-day so-called cooling-off period is over? The steel unions voluntarily cooled off for better than 5 months before they were forced to strike. It would be ridiculous to expect them to give up their just demands under the force of a Taft-Hartley injunction. The steel industry certainly has not demonstrated any likelihood that they will accept the reasonable settlement presented to it. So that would leave us around the end of September with a steel strike on again. We will then either come back to Washington and do what we should be doing now—give the President the powers he needs to handle the situation and keep steel production going, or set up a wage board able to do more than sit back and look piously on—or we will have a 3 months' shutdown in steel until we make up our minds to do something about it in January. If a strike situation should arise in any other industry vital to the defense effort, we will be confronted with the same problem there. Such a strike is threatening right now in the jet engine industry. But what have we done to face up to these cold facts? Nothing. The House is playing ostrich and hiding its head in the sands. With our heads buried we may think we can safely ignore what is going on around us. But let my Republican colleagues not forget that they are exposing themselves to attack just as the ostrich does when he lets his tail feathers fly in the breeze.

The Lucas amendment and the Smith amendment combined will work to put a ceiling on the workingman's wages—the wages out of which he has to feed and clothe and house himself and his family. What have we done to keep a ceiling on the prices of his food, clothing, and shelter? And what have we done to hold down the cost of rearming ourselves so that we will not have to pass a tax bill with skyrocketing tax rates in the next few years? The Dixie-GOP coalition has put through the Talle amendment,

which for all practical purposes decontrols everything the workingman has to buy. Watch the cost of living shoot up after that one goes into effect—if it does. They have adopted the Cole amendment guaranteeing pre-Korea percentage mark-ups to wholesalers and retailers—the price push-up amendment. And not content with that, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle with help from their Dixiecrat friends, have effectively terminated Federal rent controls as of 3 months from now by adopting the Wheeler amendment.

Looking over the roster of those who voted for these monstrous amendments we find the same old story. The Republican friends of big business have again joined forces with the reactionary elements from the South to put a halter on the wage earner and the people on low fixed incomes—the elderly people retired on social security and pensions, the pensioned veteran, and the small-salaried white-collar worker. I, personally, want no part of the responsibility for such action.

I cannot conscientiously vote for H. R. 8210 in its present form. I voted against each of the amendments I have named. In the face of the amendment-ridden controls laws that will come out of this bill it would almost have been better had the Barden amendment taking off all wage and price controls been allowed to stand. At least, the laboring man would have had a sporting chance to try for wage increases to match soaring prices. As it is we are left with a choice of voting for a bill to clamp down on wages while letting business put the clamps on the consumer, or no bill at all. I cannot go for that kind of a squeeze play. The RECORD will show that I voted against this controls bill. Let it also show that I believe a firm and fair system of controls to be an urgent necessity now, but that I cannot and will not be a party to passage of a bill controlling nothing but the price of labor, and, at the same time, handcuffing labor against any effort to keep its standards up to what is referred to as the "American way of life."

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

The CHAIRMAN. Time was fixed to conclude debate at 2:45 p. m. There are still 3 minutes remaining. Does the gentleman desire to be recognized for that time?

Mr. McKINNON. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as this debate closes, may I point out that if the House adopts the Talle and Cole amendments, this bill cannot be truthfully called an anti-inflationary bill but a superinflationary act. Time will prove that statement.

I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say a few moments ago that if prices go up in the next few months as the result of this bill—and he must presume they will—it will not be the fault of the House but the fault of the executive agency.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Take the Tolle amendment, as an example. If this amendment is finally adopted, no item can be price controlled if it is deemed in surplus for the preceding 90 days. Surplus is defined in the amendment as an item not being allocated, or rationed at the retail level.

Now many things today are in surplus, according to that definition but they most assuredly are selling at ceiling prices, and will sell at even higher prices if the Talle amendment is adopted.

Consider the shoes you are now wearing. You bought them at ceiling prices, but they are not in short supply. If we are to maintain ceiling prices, we must ration them—at a burden to the consumer and a cost to the taxpayer. If we do not ration them, the price increases.

On page 12 of the committee hearings is a table which shows that, on March 15, 1952, 50 percent of the items included in the cost-of-living index were at their all-time peak. Eighty-five percent of these items were within 5 percent of their all-time peak. On March 15, this cost-of-living index was at 188 percent of the prewar average but, on May 15, the index had risen further to 189 percent of the prewar average—it was within one-twentieth of 1 percent of its all-time high and I understand that since May 15 it probably has gone to a new high.

On page 14 of the record of the hearings I find that 96 percent of the wholesale prices that are of primary interest to business and to procurement agencies were at the very peak or only very slightly below it during the early part of this year. And, I understand that since then very little change has occurred.

Indeed, price pressure is continuing all the time. On page 1508, I find a list of items two pages long—items on which ceiling price increases have been requested from the Office of Price Stabilization as late as last month. There are 79 items, and they are not small items but many of them are broad categories. They include such a variety of things as steel mill products, glass containers, cotton ginning machinery, dinnerware, automotive repair services, fertilizer, cosmetics, newsprint, beef, pork, canned peas, soft drinks, coal at retail, and heating oil.

I looked through this long list of items for those whose prices might be controlled under the Talle amendment. I can assure you there are less than a dozen of them. There are more than five dozen of those items which, under the Talle amendment, would not be decontrolled—right after ceiling price increases have been requested for them. Does anyone believe that this five dozen items might not be immediately raised in price the day after the Talle amendment went into effect?

Does anyone believe that when the price spiral had started with these five dozen items it would stop right there? The cost of living, already at an all-time high and on the uptrend, would keep rising and rising fast. I need not tell you that the wages of millions of workers now are automatically tied to the cost of living index. They would have to be raised under the Talle amendment—industry's costs would go up—prices would be raised, wages would climb—and we would be right back on the inflationary merry-go-round.

The supporters of the Talle amendment might find it merry—but the American people would not. The American people have suffered enough from inflation. They do not want any more of it. They do not want prices raised by the Talle amendment. They want to see this amendment defeated and this time we should think of the best interest of the American consumer and not the special interest of a few who seek to make more profit.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, 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. 8210) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 696, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Talle, Lucas, Smith, Barden, Cole, and Wheeler amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TALLE: On page 3, after line 18, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 104. Section 402 (d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) The ceiling price for any material shall be suspended as long as (1) the material is selling below the ceiling price and has sold below that price for a period of 3 months; or (2) the material is in adequate or surplus supply to meet current civilian and military consumption and has been in such adequate or surplus supply for a period of 3 months. For the purpose of this paragraph, a material shall be considered in adequate or surplus supply whenever such material is not being allocated for civilian use, or in the case of an agricultural commodity or product processed in whole or substantial part therefrom, is not being rationed at the retail level of consumer goods for household and personal use, under the authority of title I of this act'."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, is not the parliamentary situation such that if this amendment prevails, no commodity can be controlled unless it is rationed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry. It is

not in the province of the Chair to interpret the laws.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 210, nays 182, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—210

Abbitt	George	Nicholson
Adair	Golden	Norrell
Allen, Calif.	Goodwin	O'Hara
Allen, Ill.	Graham	O'Konski
Andersen, H. Carl	Grant	Osmers
	Gregory	Ostertag
Anderson, Calif.	Gross	Passman
Andresen, August H.	Gwinn	Patman
	Hagen	Patten
Andrews	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips
Arends		Poage
Armstrong	Hall, Leonard W.	Potter
Auchincloss		Poulson
Baker	Halleck	Prouty
Barden	Harden	Radwan
Beamer	Harris	Rankin
Belcher	Harrison, Nebr.	Redden
Berry	Harrison, Va.	Reed, Ill.
Betts	Harrison, Wyo.	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Harvey	Rees, Kans.
Blackney	Hill	Regan
Boggs, Del.	Hillings	Riley
Bonner	Hinshaw	Rivers
Bow	Hoeven	Robeson
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Bramblett	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.
Brehm	Holmes	Sadlak
Brooks	Hope	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Saylor
Brownson	Hunter	Schenck
Bryson	Ikard	Scrivner
Budge	Jackson, Calif.	Scudder
Buffett	James	Shafer
Burleson	Jarman	Sheehan
Busbey	Jenison	Short
Bush	Jenkins	Sikes
Byrnes	Johnson	Simpson, Ill.
Cannon	Jonas	Simpson, Pa.
Carrigg	Jones, Hamilton C.	Sittler
Chatham		Smith, Kans.
Chelf	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Wis.
Chenoweth		Springer
Chiperfield	Kearney	Stanley
Church	Kearns	Stockman
Clevenger	Kersten, Wis.	Taber
Cole, Kans.	Kilburn	Talle
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Taylor
Cooley	King, Pa.	Thompson, Mich.
Cox	Larcade	
Crawford	Latham	Tollefson
Cunningham	LeCompte	Vail
Curtis, Mo.	Lovre	Van Pelt
Curtis, Nebr.	Lucas	Velde
Dague	McConnell	Vorys
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Vursell
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Weichel
Denny	McGregor	Werdel
Devereux	McIntire	Wharton
D'Ewart	McMillan	Wheeler
Dolliver	McVey	Whitten
Dondero	Mack, Wash.	Widnall
Dorn	Mahon	Williams, Miss.
Doughton	Martin, Iowa	Williams, N. Y.
Durham	Martin, Mass.	Willis
Eaton	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Ellsworth	Meader	Wilson, Tex.
Elston	Merrow	Winstead
Fernandez	Miller, Md.	Wolcott
Ford	Miller, Nebr.	Wood, Ga.
Forrester	Miller, N. Y.	Wood, Idaho
Gamble	Morton	Woodruff
Gathings	Mumma	
Gavin	Murray	

NAYS—182

Anfuso	Bennett, Fla.	Buckley
Angell	Bennett, Mich.	Burnside
Ayres	Bentsen	Burton
Bailey	Blatnik	Butler
Bakewell	Boggs, La.	Camp
Baring	Bolling	Canfield
Barrett	Bolton	Case
Bates, Mass.	Bosone	Celler
Battle	Bray	Chudoff
Beall	Brown, Ga.	Clemente
Bender	Buchanan	Colmer
Cooper	Howell	O'Brien, Mich.
Corbett	Hull	O'Brien, N. Y.
Cotton	Irving	O'Neill
Coudert	Jackson, Wash.	O'Toole
Crosser	Javits	Patterson
Crumpacker	Jones, Ala.	Perkins
Dawson	Jones, Mo.	Philbin
Deane	Judd	Polk
DeGraffenried	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Delaney	Kean	Price
Denton	Keating	Priest
Dingell	Kee	Rabaut
Dollinger	Kelley, Pa.	Rains
Donohue	Kelly, N. Y.	Ramsay
Donovan	Kennedy	Reams
Doyle	Keogh	Rhodes
Eberharter	Kerr	Ribicoff
Elliott	King, Calif.	Riehlman
Engle	Kirwan	Roberts
Fallon	Klein	Rodino
Feighan	Kluczynski	Rogers, Colo.
Fine	Lane	Rogers, Mass.
Flood	Lanham	Rooney
Fogarty	Lantaff	Roosevelt
Forand	Lesinski	Ross
Fugate	Lind	Scott, Hardie
Fulton	McCarthy	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Furcolo	McCormack	
Garmatz	McGrath	Secrest
Gary	McGuire	Seely-Brown
Gordon	McKinnon	Shelley
Granahan	McMullen	Sheppard
Granger	Machrowicz	Sieminski
Green	Mack, Ill.	Smith, Miss.
Greenwood	Madden	Smith, Va.
Hale	Magee	Spence
Hand	Mansfield	Staggers
Hardy	Marshall	Thomas
Hart	Miller, Calif.	Thornberry
Havenner	Mills	Trimble
Hays, Ark.	Mitchell	Van Zandt
Hays, Ohio	Morano	Walter
Hébert	Morgan	Watts
Hedrick	Morrison	Wier
Heffernan	Moulder	Wigglesworth
Heller	Multer	Withrow
Herter	Murdock	Wolverton
Heselton	Murphy	Yates
Hess	Norblad	Yorty
Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Combs

NOT VOTING—38

Aandahl	Evins	Richards
Abernethy	Fenton	Sabath
Addonizio	Fisher	Sasscer
Albert	Frazier	Steed
Allen, La.	Gore	Stigler
Aspinall	Herlong	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Jensen	Tackett
Beckworth	Lyle	Teague
Burdick	Morris	Thompson, Tex.
Carlyle	Nelson	Vinson
Carnahan	Pickett	Welch
Davis, Tenn.	Powell	Wickersham
Dempsey	Reece, Tenn.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Addonizio against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Welch against.

Mr. Lyle for, with Mr. Combs against.

Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.

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

Mr. BEALL and Mr. SECREST changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Kansas: Page 6, line 15, strike out section 106 and insert as follows:

"The first sentence of section 402 (k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto shall be issued under this title or remain in effect under the title for more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952, which shall deny a seller of materials or services at retail or wholesale his customary percentage margins over costs of the materials or services or his customary charges during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, or on such other nearest representative date determined under section 402 (c), as shown by his records during such period, 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'."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 231, nays 164, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—231

Adair	Cooper	Hess
Allen, Calif.	Corbett	Hill
Allen, Ill.	Coudert	Hillings
Andersen, H. Carl	Cox	Hinshaw
	Crawford	Hoeven
Anderson, Calif.	Crumpacker	Hoffman, Mich.
Andresen, August H.	Cunningham	Holmes
	Curtis, Mo.	Hope
Andrews	Curtis, Nebr.	Horan
Arends	Dague	Hunter
Armstrong	Davis, Ga.	Ikard
Auchincloss	Davis, Wis.	Jackson, Calif.
Barden	Denny	James
Bates, Mass.	Devereux	Jarman
Battle	D'Ewart	Jenison
Beall	Dolliver	Jenkins
Beamer	Dondero	Jensen
Belcher	Dorn	Johnson
Bennett, Mich.	Doughton	Jones, Hamilton C.
Bentsen	Durham	
Berry	Eaton	Jones, Woodrow W.
Betts	Ellsworth	
Bishop	Elston	Judd
Blackney	Engle	Kearney
Boggs, Del.	Fernandez	Kearns
Boggs, La.	Forrester	Keating
Bolton	Fulton	Kerr
Bow	Gamble	Kilburn
Boykin	Gathings	Kilday
Bramblett	Gavin	Larcade
Brehm	George	Latham
Brooks	Golden	LeCompte
Brown, Ga.	Goodwin	Lovre
Brown, Ohio	Graham	Lucas
Bryson	Grant	McConnell
Budge	Gross	McCulloch
Buffett	Gwinn	McDonough
Burleson	Hagen	McGregor
Busbey	Hale	McIntire
Bush	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McMillan
Butler		McVey
Byrnes	Hall, Leonard W.	Mahon
Cannon		Martin, Iowa
Carrigg	Halleck	Martin, Mass.
Chatham	Hand	Mason
Chenoweth	Harden	Meader
Chiperfield	Harris	Merrow
Church	Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Md.
Clevenger	Harrison, Va.	Miller, Nebr.
Cole, Kans.	Harrison, Wyo.	Miller, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Harvey	Morton
Colmer	Hébert	Mumma

Murray	Rogers, Fla.	Teague
Nelson	Rogers, Tex.	Thomas
Nicholson	Sadlak	Thompson, Mich.
Norblad	St. George	Thornberry
Norrell	Saylor	Tollefson
O'Hara	Schenck	Vail
Osmers	Scott, Hardie	Van Pelt
Ostertag	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Velde
Passman	Scrivner	Vorys
Patten	Scudder	Vursell
Phillips	Shafer	Weichel
Poage	Sheehan	Werdel
Potter	Sheppard	Wharton
Poulson	Short	Wheeler
Preston	Simpson, Ill.	Whitten
Prouty	Simpson, Pa.	Widnall
Radwan	Sittler	Williams, Miss.
Rankin	Smith, Kans.	Williams, N. Y.
Redden	Smith, Miss.	Willis
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Va.	Wilson, Ind.
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Tex.
Rees, Kans.	Springer	Winstead
Regan	Stanley	Wolcott
Riehlman	Stockman	Wood, Ga.
Riley	Taber	Wood, Idaho
Rivers	Talle	Woodruff
Robeson	Taylor	
Rogers, Colo.		

NAYS—164

Abbitt	Gordon	Mansfield
Anfuso	Granahan	Marshall
Angell	Granger	Miller, Calif.
Ayres	Green	Mills
Bailey	Greenwood	Mitchell
Baker	Gregory	Morano
Bakewell	Hardy	Morgan
Baring	Hart	Morrison
Barrett	Havenner	Moulder
Bender	Hays, Ark.	Multer
Bennett, Fla.	Hays, Ohio	Murdock
Blatnik	Hedrick	Murphy
Bolling	Heffernan	O'Brien, Ill.
Bonner	Heller	O'Brien, Mich.
Bosone	Herter	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bray	Heselton	O'Konski
Brownson	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Neill
Buchanan	Holifield	O'Toole
Buckley	Howell	Patman
Burnside	Hull	Patterson
Burton	Irving	Perkins
Camp	Jackson, Wash.	Philbin
Canfield	Javits	Polk
Case	Jonas	Price
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Chelf	Jones, Mo.	Rabaut
Chudoff	Karsten, Mo.	Rains
Clemente	Kean	Ramsay
Combs	Kee	Rhodes
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Ribicoff
Cotton	Kelly, N. Y.	Roberts
Crosser	Kennedy	Rodino
Dawson	Keogh	Rogers, Mass.
Deane	Kersten, Wis.	Rooney
DeGraffenried	King, Calif.	Roosevelt
Delaney	King, Pa.	Ross
Denton	Kirwan	Secrest
Dingell	Klein	Seely-Brown
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Shelley
Donohue	Lane	Sieminski
Donovan	Lanham	Sikes
Doyle	Lantaff	Spence
Eberharter	Lesinski	Staggers
Elliott	Lind	Trimble
Fallon	McCarthy	Van Zandt
Feighan	McCormack	Walter
Fine	McGrath	Watts
Flood	McGuire	Wier
Fogarty	McKinnon	Wigglesworth
Forand	McMullen	Withrow
Ford	Machrowicz	Wolverton
Fugate	Mack, Ill.	Yates
Furcolo	Mack, Wash.	Yorty
Garmatz	Madden	Zablocki
Gary	Magee	

NOT VOTING—36

Aandahl	Dempsey	Reece, Tenn.
Abernethy	Evins	Richards
Addonizio	Fenton	Sabath
Albert	Fisher	Sasscer
Allen, La.	Frazier	Steed
Aspinall	Gore	Stigler
Bates, Ky.	Herlong	Sutton
Beckworth	Lyle	Tackett
Burdick	Morris	Thompson, Tex.
Carlyle	Pickett	Vinson
Carnahan	Powell	Welch
Davis, Tenn.	Reams	Wickersham

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Addonizio against.
Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Welch against.
Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Bates of Kentucky against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Reams.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUCAS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. KEARNS: On page 7, after line 18, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 109. Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended by Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951, is amended by inserting '(a)' after '403.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) (1) There is hereby created, in the Economic Stabilization Agency, a Wage Stabilization Board (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of members representative of the general public, members representative of labor, and members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board shall be established by Executive order, but the number of members representative of the general public shall at all times exceed the aggregate of the number of members representative of labor and the number of members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board for representatives of labor shall equal the number of offices on the Board for representatives of business and industry. Among the members representative of labor, at least one shall be a person who is not a representative of any organization which is affiliated with either of the two major labor organizations.

"'(2) The members representative of the general public shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall be appointed by the President. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among the members representative of the general public.

"'(3) The term of office of the members of the Board shall be 1 year, unless sooner terminated in accordance with section 717. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"'(4) Each member representative of the general public shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year, and while a member of the Board shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment. Each member representative of labor, and each member representative of business and industry, shall receive $50 for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board, and in addition he shall be paid his actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while so engaged away from his home or regular place of business. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall, in respect of their functions on the Board, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"'(5) The Board shall, under the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator—

"'((A) formulate, and recommend to such Administrator for promulgation, general policies and general regulations relating to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation; and

"'(B) upon the request of (i) any person substantially affected thereby, or (ii) any Federal department or agency whose functions, as provided by law, may be affected thereby or may have an effect thereon, advise as to the interpretation, or the application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations promulgated by such Administrator which relate to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation.

"'For the purposes of this act, stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation means prescribing maximum limits thereon. Except as provided in clause (B) of this paragraph, the Board shall have no jurisdiction with respect to any labor dispute or with respect to any issue involved therein. Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of such regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of law heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress, and not otherwise.

"'(6) Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall take effect 30 days after the date on which this subsection is enacted. The Wage Stabilization Board created by Executive Order No. 10161, and reconstituted by Executive Order No. 10233, is hereby abolished, effective at the close of the 29th day following the date on which this subsection is enacted'."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. My recollection is that a separate vote was demanded on the Lucas amendment. My understanding is that there is no Lucas amendment, but that there is a Kearns amendment as amended by the Lucas substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. It is the Kearns amendment as amended by the Lucas substitute, but it is still the Kearns amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that a request was made for a separate vote on the Lucas amendment, and all the other amendments have already been acted upon as a whole, is it in order now to have a separate vote on the Kearns amendment?

The SPEAKER. Whatever there is left is the Kearns amendment as amended by the Lucas substitute. The Chair is going to hold that it is subject to being voted on now.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 138, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—256

Abbitt	Gary	Morton
Adair	Gathings	Mumma
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Murray
Allen, Ill.	George	Nelson
Andersen, H. Carl	Golden	Nicholson
	Goodwin	Norblad
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Norrell
Andresen, August H.	Grant	O'Hara
	Greenwood	Osmers
Andrews	Gregory	Ostertag
Arends	Gross	Passman
Armstrong	Gwinn	Patman
Auchincloss	Hagen	Patten
Baker	Hale	Patterson
Bakewell	Hall,	Phillips
Barden	Edwin Arthur	Poage
Bates, Mass.	Hall,	Potter
Battle	Leonard W.	Poulson
Beamer	Halleck	Preston
Belcher	Hand	Priest
Bender	Harden	Prouty
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Radwan
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Rains
Bentsen	Harrison, Nebr.	Rankin
Berry	Harrison, Va.	Reams
Betts	Harrison, Wyo.	Redden
Bishop	Harvey	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Boggs, Del.	Herter	Rees, Kans.
Boggs, La.	Hess	Regan
Bolton	Hill	Riehlman
Bonner	Hillings	Riley
Bow	Hinshaw	Rivers
Boykin	Hoeven	Robeson
Bramblett	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Brehm	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Mass.
Brooks	Holmes	Rogers, Tex.
Brown, Ga.	Hope	Ross
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Sadlak
Brownson	Hunter	St. George
Bryson	Ikard	Schenck
Budge	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hardie
Buffett	James	Scrivner
Burleson	Jarman	Scudder
Burton	Jenison	Seely-Brown
Busbey	Jenkins	Shafer
Bush	Jensen	Sheehan
Butler	Johnson	Short
Byrnes	Jonas	Simpson, Ill.
Camp	Jones, Mo.	Simpson, Pa.
Chatham	Jones,	Smith, Kans.
Chenoweth	Hamilton C.	Smith, Miss.
Chiperfield	Jones,	Smith, Va.
Church	Woodrow W.	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Judd	Springer
Cole, Kans.	Kean	Stanley
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Stockman
Colmer	Kearns	Taber
Cooley	Keating	Talle
Cooper	Kerr	Taylor
Cotton	Kersten, Wis.	Teague
Coudert	Kilburn	Thompson, Mich.
Cox	Kilday	
Crawford	King, Pa.	Thornberry
Cunningham	Larcade	Vail
Curtis, Mo.	Latham	Van Pelt
Curtis, Nebr.	LeCompte	Van Zandt
Dague	Lovre	Velde
Davis, Ga.	Lucas	Vorys
Davis, Wis.	McConnell	Vursell
Denny	McCulloch	Weichel
Devereux	McDonough	Werdel
D'Ewart	McGregor	Wharton
Dolliver	McIntire	Wheeler
Dondero	McMillan	Whitten
Dorn	McMullen	Widnall
Doughton	McVey	Wigglesworth
Durham	Mack, Wash.	Williams, Miss.
Eaton	Mahon	Williams, N. Y.
Ellsworth	Martin, Iowa	Willis
Elston	Martin, Mass.	Wilson, Ind.
Engle	Mason	Wilson, Tex.
Fallon	Meader	Winstead
Fernandez	Merrow	Wolcott
Ford	Miller, Md.	Wood, Ga.
Forrester	Miller, Nebr.	Wood, Idaho
Fugate	Miller, N. Y.	Woodruff
Gamble	Morano	

NAYS—138

Anfuso	Beall	Burnside
Angell	Bolling	Canfield
Ayres	Bosone	Cannon
Bailey	Bray	Carrigg
Baring	Buchanan	Case
Barrett	Buckley	Celler
Chelf	Hull	O'Brien, N. Y.
Chudoff	Irving	O'Konski
Clemente	Jackson, Wash.	O'Neill
Combs	Javits	O'Toole
Corbett	Jones, Ala.	Perkins
Crosser	Karsten, Mo.	Philbin
Crumpacker	Kee	Polk
Dawson	Kelley, Pa.	Price
Deane	Kelly, N. Y.	Rabaut
DeGraffenried	Keogh	Ramsay
Delaney	King, Calif.	Rhodes
Denton	Kirwan	Ribicoff
Dingell	Klein	Roberts
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Rodino
Donohue	Lane	Rogers, Colo.
Donovan	Lanham	Rooney
Doyle	Lantaff	Roosevelt
Eberharter	Lesinski	Saylor
Elliott	Lind	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Feighan	McCarthy	
Fine	McCormack	Secrest
Flood	McGrath	Shelley
Fogarty	McGuire	Sheppard
Forand	McKinnon	Sieminski
Fulton	Machrowicz	Sikes
Furcolo	Mack, Ill.	Sittler
Garmatz	Madden	Spence
Gordon	Magee	Staggers
Granahan	Mansfield	Thomas
Granger	Marshall	Tollefson
Green	Miller, Calif.	Trimble
Hart	Mills	Walter
Havenner	Mitchell	Watts
Hays, Ark.	Morgan	Wier
Hays, Ohio	Morrison	Withrow
Hedrick	Moulder	Wolverton
Heffernan	Multer	Yates
Heller	Murdock	Yorty
Heselton	Murphy	Zablocki
Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.	
Howell	O'Brien, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—37

Aandahl	Dempsey	Richards
Abernethy	Evins	Sabath
Addonizio	Fenton	Sasscer
Albert	Fisher	Steed
Allen, La.	Frazier	Stigler
Aspinall	Gore	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Herlong	Tackett
Beckworth	Kennedy	Thompson, Tex.
Blatnik	Lyle	Vinson
Burdick	Morris	Welch
Carlyle	Pickett	Wickersham
Carnahan	Powell	
Davis, Tenn.	Reece, Tenn.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Welch against.
Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Addonizio against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Burdick.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 9, after line 10, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 111. Section 503 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'It is the sense of the Congress that by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled and the Congress therefore requests the President to invoke immediately the national emergency provisions of sections 206 to 210, inclusive, of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage'."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 164, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—228

Abbitt	Gavin	Norblad
Adair	Goodwin	Norrell
Allen, Calif.	Graham	Ostertag
Allen, Ill.	Grant	Patman
Andersen, H. Carl	Greenwood	Patten
	Gregory	Phillips
Anderson, Calif.	Gwinn	Poage
Andresen, August H.	Hale	Potter
	Hall,	Poulson
Andrews	Edwin Arthur	Preston
Arends	Hall,	Priest
Auchincloss	Leonard W.	Prouty
Ayres	Halleck	Radwan
Barden	Hardy	Rankin
Bates, Mass.	Harrison, Nebr.	Reams
Battle	Harrison, Va.	Redden
Beall	Harrison, Wyo.	Reed, Ill.
Belcher	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Bender	Hays, Ark.	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Fla.	Herter	Regan
Bentsen	Hess	Riehlman
Berry	Hill	Riley
Betts	Hillings	Rivers
Blackney	Hoeven	Robeson
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Boggs, La.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Mass.
Bolton	Holmes	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Hope	Ross
Bow	Horan	Sadlak
Boykin	Hunter	St. George
Bramblett	Ikard	Schenck
Brehm	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hardie
Brooks	Jarman	Scrivner
Brown, Ga.	Jenison	Scudder
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Shafer
Bryson	Jensen	Short
Buffett	Johnson	Sikes
Burleson	Jonas	Simpson, Ill.
Burton	Jones, Hamilton C.	Simpson, Pa.
Busbey		Smith, Kans.
Bush	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Miss.
Byrnes		Smith, Va.
Camp	Judd	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	Kean	Springer
Chelf	Kearney	Stanley
Chenoweth	Kearns	Stockman
Chiperfield	Keating	Taber
Church	Kerr	Talle
Clevenger	Kersten, Wis.	Taylor
Cole, Kans.	Kilburn	Teague
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Thomas
Colmer	Lanham	Thompson, Mich.
Cooper	Lantaff	
Cotton	Larcade	Thornberry
Coudert	Latham	Trimble
Cox	LeCompte	Vail
Crawford	Lovre	Van Pelt
Cunningham	Lucas	Van Zandt
Curtis, Nebr.	McConnell	Velde
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Vorys
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Vursell
Deane	McGregor	Watts
Denny	McIntire	Weichel
Devereux	McMillan	Werdel
D'Ewart	McMullen	Wharton
Dondero	McVey	Wheeler
Dorn	Mahon	Whitten
Doughton	Martin, Iowa	Widnall
Durham	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Ellsworth	Mason	Williams, Miss.
Elston	Meader	Willis
Fallon	Merrow	Wilson, Tex.
Fernandez	Miller, Md.	Winstead
Fisher	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Ford	Miller, N. Y.	Wood, Ga.
Forrester	Mills	Wood, Idaho
Gamble	Mumma	Woodruff
Gary	Murray	
Gathings	Nicholson	

NAYS—164

Anfuso	Bishop	Burnside
Angell	Blatnik	Butler
Armstrong	Bolling	Canfield
Bailey	Bosone	Cannon
Bakewell	Bray	Carrigg
Baring	Brownson	Case
Barrett	Buchanan	Celler
Beamer	Buckley	Chudoff
Bennett, Mich.	Budge	Clemente

Cooley	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Corbett	Howell	O'Brien, Mich.
Crosser	Hull	O'Brien, N. Y.
Crumpacker	Irving	O'Hara
Curtis, Mo.	Jackson, Wash.	O'Konski
Dague	James	O'Neill
Dawson	Javits	Osmers
DeGraffenried	Jones, Ala.	O'Toole
Delaney	Jones, Mo.	Passman
Denton	Karsten, Mo.	Patterson
Dingell	Kee	Perkins
Dollinger	Kelley, Pa.	Philbin
Dolliver	Kelly, N. Y.	Polk
Donohue	Kennedy	Price
Donovan	Keogh	Rabaut
Doyle	King, Calif.	Rains
Eberharter	King, Pa.	Ramsay
Elliott	Kirwan	Rhodes
Engle	Klein	Ribicoff
Feighan	Kluczynski	Roberts
Fine	Lane	Rodino
Flood	Lesinski	Rogers, Colo.
Fogarty	Lind	Rooney
Forand	McCarthy	Roosevelt
Fugate	McCormack	Saylor
Fulton	McGrath	Scott,
Furcolo	McGuire	Hugh D., Jr.
Garmatz	McKinnon	Secrest
Gordon	Machrowicz	Seely-Brown
Granahan	Mack, Ill.	Sheehan
Granger	Mack, Wash.	Shelley
Green	Madden	Sheppard
Gross	Magee	Sieminski
Hagen	Mansfield	Sittler
Hand	Marshall	Spence
Harden	Miller, Calif.	Staggers
Harris	Mitchell	Tollefson
Hart	Morano	Walter
Havenner	Morgan	Wier
Hays, Ohio	Morrison	Williams, N. Y.
Hébert	Morton	Wilson, Ind.
Hedrick	Moulder	Withrow
Heffernan	Multer	Wolverton
Heller	Murdock	Yates
Heselton	Murphy	Yorty
Hinshaw	Nelson	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Combs

NOT VOTING—39

Aandahl	Dempsey	Reece, Tenn.
Abernethy	Eaton	Richards
Addonizio	Evins	Sabath
Albert	Fenton	Sasscer
Allen, La.	Frazier	Steed
Aspinall	George	Stigler
Baker	Golden	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Tackett
Beckworth	Herlong	Thompson, Tex.
Burdick	Lyle	Vinson
Carlyle	Morris	Welch
Carnahan	Pickett	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Powell	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Addonizio against.
Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Lyle for, with Mr. Combs against.
Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Welch against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. George.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Golden.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Baker.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, on this roll call I voted "nay." I have a live pair with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LYLE. Were he present he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and ask to be recorded present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 11, line 10, after "1952", insert "*Provided, however,* That title 4 and all authority thereunder shall terminate at the close of July 31, 1952."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 151, nays 244, answering "present" 1, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—151

Allen, Calif.	Fisher	Mumma
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Nicholson
Andersen, H. Carl	George	O'Hara
	Golden	Patten
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Phillips
Andresen, August H.	Graham	Poage
	Gross	Potter
Andrews	Gwinn	Poulson
Arends	Hagen	Rankin
Ayres	Halleck	Redden
Barden	Harden	Reed, Ill.
Beamer	Harrison, Nebr.	Reed, N. Y.
Belcher	Harrison, Va.	Rees, Kans.
Berry	Harvey	Regan
Betts	Hébert	Rivers
Bishop	Hill	Robeson
Blackney	Hillings	Rogers, Fla.
Boggs, Del.	Hoeven	Rogers, Tex.
Bow	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Bramblett	Hoffman, Mich.	Saylor
Brehm	Hope	Schenck
Brown, Ohio	Hunter	Scrivner
Buffett	Ikard	Scudder
Burleson	Jackson, Calif.	Shafer
Busbey	James	Sheehan
Bush	Jarman	Short
Byrnes	Jenison	Simpson, Ill.
Cannon	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Chatham	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Chenoweth	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Miss.
Chiperfield		Smith, Wis.
Church	Kearns	Springer
Clevenger	Kilburn	Stockman
Cole, Kans.	Kilday	Taber
Cole, N. Y.	King, Pa.	Talle
Cooley	LeCompte	Teague
Cox	Loyre	Thompson, Mich.
Crawford	Lucas	
Crumpacker	McConnell	Vail
Cunningham	McCulloch	Velde
Curtis, Mo.	McDonough	Vorys
Curtis, Nebr.	McGregor	Vursell
Davis, Ga.	McIntire	Werdel
Davis, Wis.	McVey	Wharton
D'Ewart	Mahon	Wheeler
Dolliver	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn	Mason	Wilson, Tex.
Doughton	Merrow	Wolcott
Durham	Miller, Md.	Wood, Ga.
Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.	Wood, Idaho
Elston	Mills	Woodruff
Fernandez	Morton	

NAYS—244

Abbitt	Brownson	Denton
Adair	Bryson	Devereux
Anfuso	Buchanan	Dingell
Angell	Buckley	Dollinger
Armstrong	Budge	Dondero
Auchincloss	Burnside	Donohue
Bailey	Burton	Donovan
Baker	Butler	Doyle
Bakewell	Camp	Eberharter
Baring	Canfield	Elliott
Barrett	Carrigg	Engle
Bates, Mass.	Case	Fallon
Battle	Celler	Feighan
Beall	Chelf	Fine
Bender	Chudoff	Flood
Bennett, Fla.	Clemente	Fogarty
Bennett, Mich.	Colmer	Forand
Bentsen	Cooper	Ford
Blatnik	Corbett	Forrester
Boggs, La.	Cotton	Fugate
Bolling	Coudert	Fulton
Bolton	Crosser	Furcolo
Bonner	Dague	Gamble
Bosone	Dawson	Garmatz
Boykin	Deane	Gary
Bray	DeGraffenried	Gathings
Brooks	Delaney	Gordon
Brown, Ga.	Denny	Granahan
Granger	Lane	Rabaut
Grant	Lanham	Radwan
Green	Lantaff	Rains
Greenwood	Larcade	Ramsay
Gregory	Latham	Reams
Hale	Lesinski	Rhodes
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Lind	Ribicoff
	McCarthy	Riehlman
Hall, Leonard W.	McCormack	Riley
	McGrath	Roberts
Hand	McGuire	Rodino
Hardy	McKinnon	Rogers, Colo.
Harris	McMillan	Rogers, Mass.
Harrison, Wyo.	McMullen	Rooney
Hart	Machrowicz	Roosevelt
Havenner	Mack, Ill.	Ross
Hays, Ark.	Mack, Wash.	Sadlak
Hays, Ohio	Madden	Scott, Hardie
Hedrick	Magee	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Heffernan	Mansfield	
Heller	Marshall	Secrest
Herter	Martin, Mass.	Seely-Brown
Heselton	Meader	Shelley
Hess	Miller, Calif.	Sheppard
Hinshaw	Miller, N. Y.	Sieminski
Holifield	Mitchell	Sikes
Holmes	Morano	Sittler
Horan	Morgan	Smith, Va.
Howell	Morrison	Spence
Hull	Moulder	Staggers
Irving	Multer	Stanley
Jackson, Wash.	Murdock	Taylor
Javits	Murphy	Thomas
Johnson	Murray	Thornberry
Jonas	Nelson	Tollefson
Jones, Ala.	Norblad	Trimble
Jones, Mo.	Norrell	Van Pelt
Jones, Hamilton C.	O'Brien, Ill.	Van Zandt
	O'Brien, Mich.	Walter
Judd	O'Brien, N. Y.	Watts
Karsten, Mo.	O'Konski	Weichel
Kean	O'Neill	Whitten
Kearney	Osmers	Widnall
Keating	Ostertag	Wier
Kee	O'Toole	Wigglesworth
Kelley, Pa.	Passman	Williams, Miss.
Kelly, N. Y.	Patman	Williams, N. Y.
Kennedy	Patterson	Willis
Keogh	Perkins	Winstead
Kerr	Philbin	Withrow
Kersten, Wis.	Polk	Wolverton
King, Calif.	Preston	Yates
Kirwan	Price	Yorty
Klein	Priest	Zablocki
Kluczynski	Prouty	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Combs

NOT VOTING—35

Aandahl	Dempsey	Richards
Abernethy	Eaton	Sabath
Addonizio	Evins	Sasscer
Albert	Fenton	Steed
Allen, La.	Frazier	Stigler
Aspinall	Gore	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Herlong	Tackett
Beckworth	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Burdick	Morris	Vinson
Carlyle	Pickett	Welch
Carnahan	Powell	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Reece, Tenn.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Vinson against.
Mr. Lyle for, with Mr. Combs against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr Fenton.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a live pair with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LYLE. Were he present, he would vote "yea." I, therefore, withdraw my vote and vote "present."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHEELER: On page 11, strike out lines 17 to 20, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) (1) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of September 30, 1952, except that they shall cease to be in effect at the close of March 31, 1953—

"'(A) in any area which prior to or subsequent to September 30, 1952, is certified under subsection (1) of section 204 of this act as a critical defense housing area;

"'(B) in any incorporated city, town, or village which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, or village; and

"'(C) in any unincorporated locality in a defense-rental area in which one or more incorporated cities, towns, or villages constituting the major portion of the defense-rental area have made the declaration specified in subparagraph (B) at a time when maximum rents under this title were in effect in such unincorporated locality.

"'(2) Any incorporated city, town, or village which makes the declarations specified in paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken.

"'(3) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect upon the date of a proclamation by the President or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this title is not necessary because of the existence of an emergency, whichever date is the earlier.

"'(4) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) or (3) of this subsection, the provisions of this title and regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit or action with respect to any right or liability incurred prior to the termination date specified in such paragraph.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 225, nays 170, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—225

Abbitt	Bender	Bryson
Adair	Bennett, Fla.	Budge
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Buffett
Allen, Ill.	Bentsen	Burleson
Andersen, H. Carl	Berry	Busbey
	Betts	Bush
Anderson, Calif.	Bishop	Byrnes
Andresen, August H.	Blackney	Carrigg
	Boggs, Del.	Chatham
Arends	Bolton	Chenoweth
Armstrong	Bow	Chiperfield
Auchincloss	Boykin	Church
Ayres	Bramblett	Clevenger
Barden	Bray	Cole, Kans.
Bates, Mass.	Brehm	Cole, N. Y.
Beall	Brooks	Colmer
Beamer	Brown, Ohio	Cooley
Belcher	Brownson	Cooper
Cotton	Ikard	Rankin
Cox	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Crawford	James	Reed, Ill.
Crumpacker	Jarman	Reed, N. Y.
Cunningham	Jenison	Rees, Kans.
Curtis, Mo.	Jenkins	Regan
Curtis, Nebr.	Jensen	Riehlman
Dague	Johnson	Riley
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Rivers
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Mo.	Robeson
Denny	Jones, Hamilton C.	Rogers, Fla.
Devereux		Rogers, Tex.
D'Ewart	Jones, Woodrow W.	Ross
Dolliver		Sadlak
Dondero	Judd	St. George
Dorn	Kearney	Saylor
Doughton	Kearns	Schenck
Durham	Keating	Scott, Hardie
Ellsworth	Kersten, Wis.	Scrivner
Elston	Kilburn	Scudder
Engle	Kilday	Shafer
Fernandez	King, Pa.	Sheehan
Fisher	Lantaff	Short
Ford	LeCompte	Sikes
Forrester	Lovre	Simpson, Ill.
Fulton	Lucas	Simpson, Pa.
Gamble	McConnell	Sittler
Gathings	McCulloch	Smith, Kans.
Gavin	McDonough	Smith, Va.
George	McGregor	Smith, Wis.
Golden	McIntire	Springer
Goodwin	McMullen	Stanley
Graham	McVey	Stockman
Grant	Mack, Wash.	Taber
Gross	Mahon	Talle
Gwinn	Martin, Iowa	Taylor
Hagen	Martin, Mass.	Teague
Hale	Mason	Thompson, Mich.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meader	
	Merrow	Vail
Hall, Leonard W.	Miller, Md.	Van Pelt
	Miller, Nebr.	Van Zandt
Halleck	Miller, N. Y.	Velde
Harden	Morton	Vorys
Harrison, Nebr.	Mumma	Vursell
Harrison, Va.	Murray	Weichel
Harrison, Wyo.	Nicholson	Werdel
Harvey	Norblad	Wharton
Hébert	O'Hara	Wheeler
Hedrick	Osmers	Widnall
Hess	Ostertag	Williams, Miss.
Hill	Passman	Williams, N. Y.
Hillings	Patten	Willis
Hinshaw	Phillips	Wilson, Ind.
Hoeven	Poage	Wilson, Tex.
Hoffman, Ill.	Potter	Wolcott
Hoffman, Mich.	Poulson	Wood, Ga.
Hope	Preston	Wood, Idaho
Horan	Prouty	
Hunter	Radwan	

NAYS—170

Andrews	Eberharter	Kennedy
Anfuso	Elliott	Keogh
Angell	Fallon	Kerr
Bailey	Feighan	King, Calif.
Baker	Fine	Kirwan
Bakewell	Flood	Klein
Baring	Fogarty	Kluczynski
Barrett	Forand	Lane
Battle	Fugate	Lanham
Blatnik	Furcolo	Larcade
Boggs, La.	Garmatz	Latham
Bolling	Gary	Lesinski
Bonner	Gordon	Lind
Bosone	Granahan	McCarthy
Brown, Ga.	Granger	McCormack
Buchanan	Green	McGrath
Buckley	Greenwood	McGuire
Burnside	Gregory	McKinnon
Burton	Hand	McMillan
Butler	Hardy	Machrowicz
Camp	Harris	Mack, Ill.
Canfield	Hart	Madden
Cannon	Havenner	Magee
Case	Hays, Ark.	Mansfield
Celler	Hays, Ohio	Marshall
Chelf	Heffernan	Miller, Calif.
Chudoff	Heller	Mills
Clemente	Herter	Mitchell
Combs	Heselton	Morano
Corbett	Holifield	Morgan
Coudert	Holmes	Morrison
Crosser	Howell	Moulder
Dawson	Hull	Multer
Deane	Irving	Murdock
DeGraffenried	Jackson, Wash.	Murphy
Delaney	Javits	Nelson
Denton	Jones, Ala.	Norrell
Dingell	Karsten, Mo.	O'Brien, Ill.
Dollinger	Kean	O'Brien, Mich.
Donohue	Kee	O'Brien, N. Y.
Donovan	Kelley, Pa.	O'Konski
Doyle	Kelly, N. Y.	O'Neill
O'Toole	Rodino	Thomas
Patman	Rogers, Colo.	Thornberry
Patterson	Rogers, Mass.	Tollefson
Perkins	Rooney	Trimble
Philbin	Roosevelt	Walter
Polk	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Watts
Price		Whitten
Priest	Secrest	Wier
Rabaut	Seely-Brown	Wigglesworth
Rains	Shelley	Winstead
Ramsay	Sheppard	Withrow
Reams	Sieminski	Wolverton
Rhodes	Smith, Miss.	Yates
Ribicoff	Spence	Yorty
Roberts	Staggers	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—36

Aandahl	Dempsey	Richards
Abernethy	Eaton	Sabath
Addonizio	Evins	Sasscer
Albert	Fenton	Steed
Allen, La.	Frazier	Stigler
Aspinall	Gore	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Herlong	Tackett
Beckworth	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Burdick	Morris	Vinson
Carlyle	Pickett	Welch
Carnahan	Powell	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Reece, Tenn.	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Addonizio against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Lyle with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NICHOLSON moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 8210) to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 12, following line 5, add another section as follows:

"SEC. —. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(q) Except in the case of action taken after full compliance with subsection (k) of this section, the President shall not reestablish maximum rents in any locality which has previously been decontrolled under this act until a public hearing, after 30 days' notice, has been held in such locality, and the governing body of said locality has by resolution, adopted in accordance with applicable local law, found that the conditions set forth in subsection (1) exist in said locality.'"

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 211, nays 185, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—211

Abbitt	Gavin	Morrison
Allen, Calif.	Gordon	Morton
Anfuso	Graham	Moulder
Angell	Granger	Multer
Armstrong	Gregory	Mumma
Auchincloss	Hale	Murdock
Ayres	Hall,	Murphy
Baker	Leonard W.	Murray
Bakewell	Halleck	Norblad
Baring	Hand	Norrell
Bates, Mass.	Hardy	O'Brien, Ill.
Battle	Harris	O'Brien, Mich.
Beamer	Hart	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bender	Hays, Ark.	Osmers
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Ostertag
Bentsen	Hedrick	Passman
Blackney	Heffernan	Patman
Boggs, Del.	Heller	Philbin
Boggs, La.	Herlong	Polk
Bolling	Herter	Preston
Bolton	Heselton	Priest
Bonner	Hess	Prouty
Bosone	Holifield	Rabaut
Boykin	Holmes	Radwan
Brooks	Horan	Rains
Brown, Ga.	Howell	Ramsay
Brownson	Hull	Reams
Bryson	Irving	Redden
Burton	Jackson, Wash.	Riehlman
Byrnes	James	Riley
Camp	Jarman	Rivers
Canfield	Javits	Roberts
Cannon	Johnson	Robeson
Carrigg	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Case	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Jones,	Rogers, Fla.
Chatham	Hamilton C.	Rogers, Mass.
Chelf	Jones,	Rooney
Clemente	Woodrow W.	Ross
Colmer	Judd	Sadlak
Combs	Kean	Schenck
Cooley	Kearney	Scudder
Cooper	Keating	Secrest
Cotton	Kennedy	Sieminski
Coudert	Keogh	Sikes
Cox	Kerr	Smith, Miss.
Crosser	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Va.
Crumpacker	Kilburn	Spence
Curtis, Mo.	King, Calif.	Stanley
Dague	Kluczynski	Talle
Deane	Lane	Taylor
DeGraffenried	Lantaff	Thomas
Delaney	Larcade	Thornberry
Denny	Latham	Tollefson
Devereux	Lesinski	Trimble
Dingell	Lind	Van Pelt
Dondero	McCarthy	Van Zandt
Donohue	McConnell	Vorys
Doughton	McCormack	Watts
Durham	McKinnon	Weichel
Eaton	McMillan	Whitten
Elliott	McMullen	Widnall
Engle	Machrowicz	Wier
Fallon	Mack, Wash.	Wigglesworth
Fernandez	Magee	Williams, Miss.
Forrester	Martin, Mass.	Williams, N. Y.
Fugate	Meader	Willis
Furcolo	Merrow	Winstead
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Yates
Garmatz	Miller, N. Y.	Zablocki
Gary	Mitchell	
Gathings	Morano	

NAYS—185

Adair	Berry	Busbey
Allen, Ill.	Betts	Bush
Andersen,	Bishop	Butler
H. Carl	Blatnik	Chenoweth
Anderson, Calif.	Bow	Chiperfield
Andresen,	Bramblett	Chudoff
August H.	Bray	Church
Andrews	Brehm	Clevenger
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Cole, Kans.
Bailey	Buchanan	Cole, N. Y.
Barden	Buckley	Corbett
Barrett	Budge	Crawford
Beall	Buffett	Cunningham
Belcher	Burleson	Curtis, Nebr.
Bennett, Mich.	Burnside	Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.	Jenison	Reed, Ill.
Dawson	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Denton	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
D'Ewart	Jonas	Regan
Dollinger	Karsten, Mo.	Rhodes
Dolliver	Kearns	Ribicoff
Donovan	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.
Dorn	Kelly, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Doyle	Kilday	St. George
Eberharter	King, Pa.	Saylor
Ellsworth	Kirwan	Scott, Hardie
Elston	Klein	Scott,
Feighan	Lanham	Hugh D., Jr.
Fine	LeCompte	Scrivner
Fisher	Lovre	Seely-Brown
Flood	Lucas	Shafer
Fogarty	McCulloch	Sheehan
Forand	McDonough	Shelley
Ford	McGrath	Sheppard
Fulton	McGregor	Short
George	McGuire	Simpson, Ill.
Golden	McIntire	Simpson, Pa.
Goodwin	McVey	Sittler
Granahan	Mack, Ill.	Smith, Kans.
Grant	Madden	Smith, Wis.
Green	Mahon	Springer
Greenwood	Mansfield	Staggers
Gross	Marshall	Stockman
Gwinn	Martin, Iowa	Taber
Hagen	Mason	Teague
Hall,	Miller, Md.	Thompson,
Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.	Mich.
Harden	Mills	Vail
Harrison, Nebr.	Morgan	Velde
Harrison, Va.	Nelson	Vursell
Harrison, Wyo.	Nicholson	Walter
Harvey	O'Hara	Werdel
Havenner	O'Konski	Wharton
Hays, Ohio	O'Neill	Wheeler
Hill	O'Toole	Wilson, Ind.
Hillings	Patten	Wilson, Tex.
Hinshaw	Patterson	Withrow
Hoeven	Perkins	Wolcott
Hoffman, Ill.	Phillips	Wolverton
Hoffman, Mich.	Poage	Wood, Ga.
Hope	Potter	Wood, Idaho
Hunter	Poulson	Yorty
Ikard	Price	
Jackson, Calif.	Rankin	

NOT VOTING—35

Aandahl	Dempsey	Sabath
Abernethy	Evins	Sasscer
Addonizio	Fenton	Steed
Albert	Frazier	Stigler
Allen, La.	Gore	Sutton
Aspinall	Kee	Tackett
Bates, Ky.	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Beckworth	Morris	Vinson
Burdick	Pickett	Welch
Carlyle	Powell	Wickersham
Carnahan	Reece, Tenn.	Woodruff
Davis, Tenn.	Richards	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Addonizio for, with Mr. Dempsey against.

Mr. Welch for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Pickett against.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.

Mrs. Kee with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. JONAS, Mr. HARDIE SCOTT, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. WITHROW, and Mr. BURNSIDE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have voted against final passage of this so-called Price and Rent Control Act.

Actually this bill as passed controls neither prices nor rents, and as a matter of fact the only control feature in it is that it controls wages. This seems to me manifestly unfair. In fact it is a fraud on the American people since it gives the impression that it controls prices and rents. With the Talle amendment it decontrols prices on all of the essential commodities. With the Wheeler amendment, leaving up to the local communities the decision as to whether there should be rent control, it in effect provides for no rent controls whatsoever.

While it is true that in the State of New York we have a State rent-control law, when we legislate here we do so for the entire country and not on a sectional basis; and therefore I cannot bring myself to vote for a bill which will really offer no rent controls to the people of the country.

As I pointed out in my remarks yesterday, we are in an emergency period where we need these controls—both price and rent. The cost of living has been going up consistently; yet we take the position here that we do not need any of these controls. It does not require much of a memory to remember what happened when the Emergency Price Control Act, which was in effect during World War II, was discontinued In spite of the cries of the business interests that if controls were removed prices would come down, they actually had the opposite effect. Prices have never been as high in the history of our country as they are today; yet here we are making the same mistake again.

I appreciate that many of my colleagues have been undecided as to whether to vote for this bill and take a chance on a better bill coming out of conference, or to take the straightforward action of voting against it. I am certain that if this bill were defeated, a simple extension resolution would be brought in extending the law as it now stands, even though it is quite weak, what with the Capehart and Herlong amendments in it.

The manifest fraud in presenting this bill to the country as a price-control bill is evidenced by the fact that a majority of the unholy coalition, that is the Republicans and Southern Democrats who were instrumental in the passage of all of the emasculating amendments just passed, have voted for this bill on final passage. They evidently want to create the impression that they favor price and rent controls when actually they are guilty of destroying them. I know my constituents would have wanted me to vote against such a fraud; and I trust that when prices and rents do go up, as they inevitably must, the people of this country will know where to assess the blame.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the section numbers and the cross references in the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes, be taken from the Speaker's table, that all after the enacting clause be stricken

out, that the bill just passed be substituted, and that the bill as so amended do pass.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952."

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

SEC. 101. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, then no restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title upon the right of any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use the same in the United States. No restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title if the domestic production of any commodity is sufficient to meet all civilian domestic requirements and the requirements for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress."

SEC. 102. Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendments to existing law made by such title are hereby revived and shall continue in effect until June 30, 1953, for the purpose of authorizing and exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to 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, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply, or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,* That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased. This section shall not be construed to limit the authority contained in sections 101 and 704 of this act."

SEC. 103. Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "No ceiling shall be established or maintained under this title for fresh fruits or vegetables."

SEC. 104. Title I of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 105. (a) In carrying out the policy of the United States as set forth in section 2 of this act, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may appoint representatives to confer with other friendly nations through the mechanism of the International Materials Conference in an effort to ascertain the existing and potential supply of materials useful in the economic mobilization of this and such other nations, as well as the most effective distribution of such materials in executing that policy. Upon a finding by the President, reached after a hearing at which interested parties may express their views, that a pattern of international distribution recommended after such consultation is necessary or appropriate to promode the national defense and compatible with the best interests of the United States, he may, any other provision of this title to the contrary notwithstanding, use the authority vested in him by this act to make it possible for this Nation to carry out the recommendations made by any such conference.

"(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, nothing contained in this act shall impair the authority of the President under this act to exercise allocation and priorities controls over materials both domestically produced and imported and facilities through the controlled materials plan or other methods of allocation."

PRICE AND WAGE STABILIZATION

SEC. 105. Paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the case of a seller of a material at retail or wholesale within the meaning of subsection (k) of this section."

SEC. 106. (a) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding after the word "profession" in paragraph (ii) thereof the following: "; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to professional engineers employed in a professional capacity; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to professional architects employed in a professional capacity by an architect or firm of architects engaged in the practice of his or their profession; and wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to certified public accountants licensed to practice as such employed in a professional capacity by a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants engaged in the practice of his or their profession."

(b) Declaratory of existing law, paragraph (v) of subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(v) (1) Rates and charges by any common carrier or other public utility, including rates charged by any person subject to the Shipping Act, 1916 (Public Law 260, 64th Cong.), as amended, and including compensation for the use by others of a common carrier's cars or other transportation equipment, charges for the use of washroom and toilet facilities in terminals and stations, and charges for repairing cars or other transportation equipment owned by others; charges for the use of parking facilities operated by common carriers in connection with their common carrier operations; and (2) charges paid by common carriers for the performance of a part of their transportation services to the public, including the use of cars or other transportation equipment owned by a person other than a common carrier, protective service against heat or cold to property transported or to be transported, and pick-up and delivery and local transfer services: *Provided,* That no common carrier or other public utility shall at any time after the President shall have issued any stabilization regulations and orders under subsection (b) make any increase in its charges for property or services sold by it for resale to the public, for which application is filed after the date of issuance of such stabilization regulations and orders, before the Federal, State, or municipal authority, if any, having jurisdiction to consider such increase, unless it first gives 30 days' notice to the President, or such agency as he may designate, and consents to timely intervention by such agency before the Federal, State, or municipal authority, if any, having jurisdiction to consider such increase;".

(c) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(viii) Rates, fees, and charges for materials or services supplied directly by the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and their political subdivisions and municipalities, the District of Columbia, and any agency of any of the foregoing."

(d) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(ix) Annual or semiannual payments in the nature of compensation made to employees or officers of a business or enterprise which constitutes a distribution of a portion or percentage of its profits according to a profit-sharing plan or practice which was established and in effect on or before January 15, 1950. If the determination of any amount or part of the plan or practice involves the exercise of the discretion of managers of the business or enterprise, such plan or practices may be continued and payments made thereunder so long as the discretion is exercised according to the same policy standards and principles which were applicable and in effect on or before January 15, 1950."

SEC. 107. Subsection (k) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "hereafter" in the first sentence thereof.

SEC. 108. Section 402 (k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of the first sentence thereof before the period the following proviso: ": *Provided, however,* That if the antitrust laws of any State have been construed to prohibit adherence by sellers of materials for wholesale or retail to uniform suggested retail resale prices, the President shall issue regulations giving full consideration to the customary percentage margins of such sellers during the period hereinbefore set forth."

SEC. 109. Section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof two new subsections as follows:

"(l) No rule, regulation, order or amendment thereto issued under this title shall fix a ceiling on the price paid or received on the sale or delivery of any material in any State below the minimum sales price of such material fixed by the State law (other than any so-called fair trade law) or regulation now in effect.

"(m) If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, no rule, regulation, or order issued under this title shall apply to purchases by any person of any material outside of the United States or its Territories and possessions for importation into the United States for his own use or for fabrication by him into other products for resale."

SEC. 110. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, whenever price ceilings are declared in effect on any agricultural commodity at the farm level, the Director of Price Stabilization must at the same time put into effect margin controls on processors, wholesalers, and retailers, such margin controls to allow the processors, wholesalers, and retailers the normal mark-ups as provided under this act, except that under no circumstances are the sellers to be allowed greater than their normal margins of profit.

SEC. 111. Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" after "403." and by adding

at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) There is hereby created, in the present Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency, a Wage Stabilization Board (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Board'), which shall be composed, in equal numbers, of members representative of the general public, members representative of labor, and members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board shall be established by Executive order.

"(2) The members representative of the general public shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among the members representative of the general public.

"(3) The term of office of the members of the Board shall terminate on March 1, 1953. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"(4) Each member representative of the general public shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year, and while a member of the Board shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment. Each member representative of labor, and each member representative of business and industry shall receive $50 for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board, and in addition he shall be paid his actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while so engaged away from his home or regular place of business. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall, in respect of their functions on the Board, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"(5) The Board shall, under the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator—

"(A) formulate, and recommend to such Administrator for promulgation, general policies and general regulations, relating to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation; and

"(B) upon the request of (i) any person substantially affected thereby, or (ii) any Federal department or agency whose functions, as provided by law, may be affected thereby or may have an effect thereon, advise as to the interpretation, or the application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations promulgated by such Administrator which relate to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation.

For the purposes of this act, stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation means prescribing maximum limits thereon. Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of such regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress: *Provided, however,* That the Board may undertake to mediate and/or arbitrate labor disputes involving wages, salaries, and other compensation, if the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service certifies to the Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency that all remedies available to the Service have been exhausted, and (i) the parties themselves request the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate, or (ii) the President requests the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate the dispute and the parties consent: *Provided further,* That in any effort to mediate and/or arbitrate a labor dispute referred to the Board pursuant to the terms of the foregoing proviso, a panel of the Board, the membership of which is constituted in the same proportion as is the Board itself, may act on behalf of the Board.

"(6) Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall take effect 30 days after the date on which this subsection is enacted. The Wage Stabilization Board created by Executive Order No. 10161, and reconstituted by Executive Order No. 10233, as amended by Executive Order No. 10301, is hereby abolished, effective at the close of the twenty-ninth day following the date on which this subsection is enacted."

SEC. 112. Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) It shall be the express duty, obligation, and function of the present Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency to coordinate the relationship between prices and wages, and to stabilize prices and wages."

SEC. 113. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SUSPENSION OF CONTROLS

"SEC. 411. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the President shall use the price, wage, and other powers conferred by this act, as amended, to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and the demand therefor of materials and services, and that the general control of wages and prices shall be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this act; and that pending such termination, in order to avoid burdensome and unnecessary reporting and record keeping which retard rather than assist in the achievement of the purposes of this act, price or wage regulations and orders, or both, shall be suspended in the case of any material or service or type of employment where such factors as condition of supply, existence of below ceiling prices, historical volatility of prices, wage pressures and wage relationships, or relative importance in relation to business costs or living costs will permit, and to the extent that such action will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect. It is further the policy of the Congress that when the President finds that the termination of the suspension and the restoration of ceilings on the sales or charges for such material or service, or the further stabilization of such wages, salaries, and other compensation, or both, is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall by regulation or order terminate the suspension."

SEC. 114. Title V of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 504. *Resolved,* That, by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled, and the Congress requests the President to immediately invoke the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage."

SEC. 115. The first sentence of section 707 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "his."

SEC. 116. (a) Section 717 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Titles I, II, III, VI, and VII of this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1953; and titles IV and V of this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of February 28, 1953."

(b) Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

SEC. 201. Subsection (e) of section 4 and subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are each amended by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 28, 1953."

SEC. 202. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(p) Except in the case of action taken after full compliance with subsection (k) of this section, the President shall not reestablish maximum rents in any defense-rental area, including any community owned and operated by the Federal Government, which has previously been decontrolled under this act until a public hearing, after 30 days' notice, has been held in such area."

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

PUBLIC CONTRACTS

SEC. 301. The act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C. 35–45), is amended (1) by redesignating sections 10 and 11 as sections 11 and 12, respectively, and (2) by inserting immediately following section 9 a new section 10 as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Notwithstanding any provision of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, such act shall be applicable in the administration of sections 1 to 5 and 7 to 9 of this act.

"(b) All wage determinations under section 1 (b) of this act shall be made on the record after opportunity for a hearing. Review of any such wage determination, or of the applicability of any such wage determination may be had within 90 days after such determination, is made in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act by any person adversely affected or aggrieved thereby, who shall be deemed to include any manufacturer of, or regular dealer in, materials, supplies, articles, or equipment purchased or to be purchased by the Government from any source, who is in any industry to which such wage determination is applicable.

"(c) Notwithstanding the inclusion of any stipulations required by any provision of this act in any contract subject to this act, any interested person shall have the right of judicial review of any legal question which might otherwise be raised, including, but not limited to, wage determinations and the interpretation of the terms 'locality,' 'regular dealer,' 'manufacturer,' and 'open market.'"

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 2594 and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 8210 as passed, as follows: "That this act may be cited as the 'Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952'.

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

"SEC. 101. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Nor shall any restriction or other limitation be established or maintained upon the species, type, or grade of livestocks killed by any slaughterer, nor upon the types of slaughtering opera-

tions, including religious rituals, employed by any slaughterer; nor shall any requirements or regulations be established or maintained relating to the allocation or distribution of meat or meat product unless, and for the period for which, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have determined and certified to the President that the over-all supply of meat and meat products is inadequate to meet the civilian or military needs therefor: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the President from requiring the grading and grade marking of meat and meat products.'

"SEC. 102. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'When all requirements for the national defense, for the stockpiling of critical and strategic materials and for military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress have been met through allocations and priorities it shall be the policy of the United States to encourage the maximum supply of raw materials for the civilian economy, including small business, thus increasing employment opportunities and minimizing inflationary pressures. No authority granted under this act may be used to limit the domestic consumption of any material in order to restrict total United States consumption to an amount fixed by the International Materials Conference.'

"SEC. 103. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) Whenever priorities are established or allocations made under section (a) with respect to any raw material, and such priorities or allocations operate to limit the production of articles or products produced in the United States, the President shall by proclamation limit the importation, during the period such priorities or allocations are in effect, of any article or product in the manufacture or production of which such raw material is used to 100 percent of the average annual imports of such article or product during the calendar years 1947 through 1949: *Provided*, That the Tariff Commission has reported to the President that a substantial portion of the American producers of such article or product, or an article or product competitive therewith, has requested such limitations on imports: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense has not certified to the President that the American production of such article or product is insufficient to supply the essential defense needs therefor. Upon the application of any substantial American producer, the Tariff Commission shall publish the fact of having received such application, shall hold public hearing thereon and shall report the facts to the President within 60 days of the receipt of such application. Such report to the President shall include the article or product on which the import limitation has been requested, whether it contains any raw material which is under priority or allocation control, whether a substantial portion of the American producers thereof have requested the above-specified import limitation, the maximum quantity of imports which would comply with said import limitation and such other facts as the Tariff Commission deems appropriate. A copy of said report to the President shall be submitted to the Secretaary of Defense. If said report of the Tariff Commission indicates that the above-specified conditions have been met by the applicant and the Secretary of Defense has not certified to the President that the American production of such article or product is not sufficient to meet the essential defense needs, the President shall proclaim such import limitation within 30 days of his receipt of the report from the Tariff Commission. If the Secretary of Defense has certified that the American production of such article or product is insufficient to meet the essential defense needs therefor, the President shall, by proclamation, limit the imports of such article or product to such quantity as the Secretary of Defense certifies as necessary, in excess of American production, to meet the essential defense needs. All reports of the Tariff Commission and all certifications of the Secretary of Defense made hereunder shall be made public at the time of their issuance.'

"SEC. 104. Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 104. 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 imports into the United States of any such commodity or product, by types or varieties, shall be limited to such quantities as the Secretary of Agriculture finds would not (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: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture after establishing import limitations, may permit additional imports of each type and variety of the commodities specified in this section, not to exceed 10 percent of the import limitation with respect to each type and variety which he may deem necessary, taking into consideration the broad effects upon international relationships and trade. The President shall exercise the authority and powers conferred by this section.'

"SEC. 105. The first sentence of section 302 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and manufacture of newsprint.'

"SEC. 106. Paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'No regulation or order shall be issued or remain in effect, under this title, which prohibits the payment or receipt of hourly wages at a rate of $1 per hour or less.'

"SEC. 107. Section 402 (d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) The ceiling price for any material shall be suspended as long as (1) the material is selling below the ceiling price and has sold below that price for a period of 3 months; or (2) the material is in adequate or surplus supply to meet current civilian and military consumption and has been in such adequate or surplus supply for a period of 3 months. For the purpose of this paragraph, a material shall be considered in adequate or surplus supply whenever such material is not being allocated for civilian use, or, in the case of an agricultural commodity or product processed in whole or substantial part therefrom, is not being rationed at the retail level of consumer goods for household and personal use, under the authority of title I of this act.'

"SEC. 108. (a) Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting in the fifth sentence thereof, after '(1) the Agricultural Act of 1949,' the following: 'except that under any price support program announced while this title is in effect the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent of the parity price, or such higher level as may be established under section 402 of that act, for any crop of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.'"

"(b) Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No ceiling prices for products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, milk, and other dairy products shall be established or maintained in any agricultural marketing area at levels which fail to reflect for the processing of such products the cost adjustments provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection and which fail to reflect for the distributing and selling of such products the customary margin or charge provided in subsection (k) of this section. Where a State regulatory body is authorized to establish minimum and/or maximum prices for sales of fluid milk, ceiling prices established for such sales under this title shall (1) not be less than the minimum prices, or (2) be equal to the maximum prices, established by such regulatory body, as the case may be: *And provided further*, That in the case of prices of milk established by any State regulatory body, with respect to which price, parties may be deemed to contract, no ceiling price may be maintained under this title which is less than the price so established. No ceiling shall be established or maintained under this title for fruits or vegetables in fresh or processed form.'

"SEC. 109. Subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(6) For the purpose of determining the applicable ceiling price under the general ceiling price regulation issued January 26, 1951, as amended, any sale of fertilizer to the ultimate user by a person who acquired it for resale shall be considered a retail sale. This paragraph shall take effect as of January 26, 1951.'

"SEC. 110. (a) Paragraph (111) of subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(iii) Price of rentals for (a) materials furnished for publication by any press association of feature service, or (b) books, magazines, motion pictures, periodicals, or newspapers, other than as waste or scrap; or rates charged by or wages paid to any person in the business of operating or publishing a newspaper, periodical, or magazine, or operating a radio-broadcasting or television station, a motion picture or other theater enterprise, or outdoor advertising facilities.'

"SEC. 111. (a) Paragraph (v) of subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(v) Rates charged by any common carrier or other public utility, including rates charged by any person subject to the Shipping Act, 1916 (Public Law 260, 64th Cong.), as amended;'.

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

"'(viii) Prices charged and wages paid by bowling alleys.'

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

"'(ix) Wages paid for agricultural labor.'

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

"'(e) Wages, salaries, or other compensation of persons employed in small-business enterprises as defined in this paragraph: *Provided, however,* That the President may from time to time exclude from this exemption such enterprises on the basis of industries, types of business, occupations, or areas, if their exemption would be unstabilizing with respect to wages, salaries, or other compensation, prices, or manpower, or would otherwise be contrary to the purposes of this act. A small-business enterprise, for the purpose of this paragraph, is any enterprise in which a total of eight or less persons are employed in all its establishments, branches, units, or affiliates. This paragraph shall become effective 30 days after its enactment.'

"(e) Subsection 2 of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(xi) Sales of surplus materials by the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States and their political subdivisions and municipalities, the District of Columbia, and any agency of any of the foregoing.'

"SEC. 112. The first sentence of section 402 (k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto shall be issued under this title, or remain in effect under this title for more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952, which shall deny a seller of materials or services at retail or wholesale his customary percentage margins over costs of the materials or services or his customary charges during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, or on such other nearest representative date determined under section 402 (c), as shown by his records during such period, 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.'

"SEC. 113. Section 402 (k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of the first sentence thereof before the period the following proviso: ': *Provided, however,* That if the antitrust laws of any State have been construed to prohibit adherence by sellers of materials for wholesale or retail to uniform suggested retail resale prices, the President shall issue regulations giving full consideration to the customary percentage margins of such sellers during the period hereinbefore set forth.'

"SEC. 114. Section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(l) No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto issued under this title shall fix a ceiling on the price paid or received on the sale or delivery of any material in any State below the minimum sales price of such material fixed by any State law (other than any so-called fair trade law) enacted prior to July 1, 1952, or by regulation issued pursuant to such law.

"'(m) No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto shall be issued or maintained under this title, which shall deny to any hotel supply house or combination distributor, affiliated with any slaughterer or slaughtering establishment, the same ceiling price or prices for meat accorded to hotel supply houses or combination distributors which are not so affiliated.'

"SEC. 115. Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended by Defense Production Act amendments of 1951, is amended by inserting '(a)' after '403.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) (1) There is hereby created, in the Economic Stabilization Agency, a Wage Stabilization Board (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of members representative of the general public, members representative of labor, and members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board shall be established by Executive order, but the number of members representative of the general public shall at all times exceed the aggregate of the number of members representative of labor and the number of members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board for representatives of labor shall equal the number of offices on the Board for representatives of business and industry. Among the members representative of labor, at least one shall be a person who is not a representative of any organization which is affiliated with either of the two major labor organizations.

"'(2) The members representative of the general public shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry shall be appointed by the President. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among the members representative of the general public.

"'(3) The term of office of the members of the Board shall be 1 year, unless sooner terminated in accordance with section 717. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"'(4) Each member representative of the general public shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year, and while a member of the Board shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment. Each member representative of labor, and each member representative of business and industry shall receive $50 for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board, and in addition he shall be paid his actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while so engaged away from his home or regular place of business. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall, in respect of their functions on the Board, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"'(5) The Board shall, under the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator—

"'(A) formulate, and recommend to such Administrator for promulgation, general policies and general regulations relating to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation; and

"'(B) upon the request of (i) any person substantially affected thereby, or (ii) any Federal department or agency whose functions, as provided by law, may be affected thereby or may have an effect thereon, advise as to the interpretation, or the application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations promulgated by such Administrator which relate to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation.

For the purposes of this act, stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation means prescribing maximum limits thereon. Except as provided in clause (B) of this paragraph, the Board shall have no jurisdiction with respect to any labor dispute or with respect to any issue involved therein. Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of such regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress, and not otherwise.

"'(6) Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall take effect 30 days after the date on which this subsection is enacted. The Wage Stabilization Board created by Executive Order No. 10161, and reconstituted by Executive Order No. 10233, is hereby abolished, effective at the close of the 29th day following the date on which this subsection is enacted.'

"SEC. 116. (a) (1) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 407 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out 'relating to price controls under this title' and inserting in lieu thereof 'relating to price controls under this title or rent controls under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended'; and by striking out 'relating to price controls' after 'any such regulation or order'.

"(2) Subsection (b) of section 407 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'this title' the following: 'and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended,'; and by inserting after 'section 705 of this act' the following: ', or section 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, as the case may be'.

"(b) Section 408 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 408. (a) Any person who is aggrieved by the denial or partial denial of his protest may, within 30 days after such denial, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals specifying his objections and praying that the regulation or order protested be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such complaint shall forthwith be served on the President, who shall certify and file with such court a transcript of such portions of the proceedings in connection with the protest as are material under the complaint. Such transcript shall include a statement setting forth, so far as practicable, the economic data and other facts of which the President has taken official notice. Upon such filing, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of the proceeding and of all questions determined therein, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper; to permanently enjoin or set aside, in whole or in part, the regulation or order or the amendment of or supplement to the regulation or order protested; to make and enter upon the pleadings, evidence, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the President; to dismiss the petition; or to remand the proceeding to the President for further action in accordance with the court's decree: *Provided,* That the regulation or order may be modified or rescinded by the President at any time notwithstanding the pendency of such complaint. No objection to such regulation or order, and no evidence in support of any objection thereto, shall be considered by the court, unless such objection shall have been set forth by the complainant in the protest or such evidence shall be contained in the transcript. The findings of the President with respect to questions of fact, if supported by a preponderance of the evidence on the record, shall be conclusive. If application is made to the court by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence which was either offered to the President or not admitted, or which could not reasonably have been offered to the President or included by the President in such

proceedings, and the court determines that such evidence should be admitted, the court shall order the evidence to be presented to the President. The President shall promptly receive the same, and such other evidence as he deems necessary or proper, and thereupon he shall certify and file with the court a transcript thereof and any modification made in the regulation or order as a result thereof; except that on request by the President, any such evidence shall be presented directly to the court.

"'(b) The Emergency Court of Appeals is hereby continued for the purpose of the exercise of the jurisdiction granted by this title, with the powers herein specified, together with the powers heretofore granted by law to such court which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this title. So far as necessary to decision the court shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, interpret the meaning or applicability of the terms of any official action under this title or under this act as amended, of which this title is a part and with respect to this title. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this title.

"'(c) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a United States court of appeals as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any such regulation or order under this title. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation or order, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this title authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or any provision of any such regulation or order, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

"'(d) (1) Within 30 days after arraignment, or such additional time as the court may allow for good cause shown, in any criminal proceeding, and within 5 days after judgment in any civil or criminal proceeding, brought pursuant to section 409 or 706 of this act or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, involving alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the defendant may apply to the court in which the proceeding is pending for leave to file in the Emergency Court of Appeals a complaint against the President setting forth objections to the validity of any provision which the defendant is alleged to have violated or conspired to violate. The court in which the proceeding is pending shall grant such leave with respect to any objection which it finds is made in good faith and with respect to which it finds there is reasonable and substantial excuse for the defendant's failure to present such objection in a protest filed in accordance with section 407 of this title. Upon the filing of a complaint pursuant to and within 30 days from the granting of such leave, the Emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside in whole or in part the provision of the regulation or order complained of or to dismiss the complaint. The court may authorize the introduction of evidence, either to the President or directly to the court, in accordance with subsection (a) of this section. The provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any proceeding instituted in accordance with this subsection.

"'(2) In any proceeding brought pursuant to section 409 or 706 of this act or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, involving an alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the court shall stay the proceeding—

"'(i) during the period within which a complaint may be filed in the Emergency Court of Appeals pursuant to leave granted under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision;

"'(ii) during the pendency of any protest properly filed by the defendant under section 407 of this title prior to the institution of the proceeding under section 409 or 706 of this act or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, setting forth objections to the validity of such provision which the court finds to have been made in good faith; and

"'(iii) during the pendency of any judicial proceeding instituted by the defendant under this section with respect to such protest or instituted by the defendant under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision, and until the expiration of the time allowed in this section for the taking of further proceedings with respect thereto.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, stays shall be granted thereunder in civil proceedings only after judgment and upon application made within 5 days after judgment. Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, in the case of a proceeding under section 409 (a) or 706 (a) of this Act the court granting a stay under this paragraph shall issue a temporary injunction or restraining order enjoining or restraining, during the period of the stay, violations by the defendant of any provision of the regulation or order involved in the proceeding. If any provision of a regulation or order is determined to be invalid by judgment of the Emergency Court of Appeals which has become effective in accordance with section 408 (b) of this title, any proceeding pending in any court shall be dismissed, and any judgment in such proceeding vacated, to the extent that such proceeding or judgment is based upon violation of such provision. Except as provided in this subsection, the pendency of any protest under section 407 of this title, or judicial proceeding under this section, shall not be grounds for staying any proceeding brought pursuant to section 409 or 706 of this Act or section 371 of title 18, United States Code; nor, except as provided in this subsection, shall any retroactive effect be given to any judgment setting aside a provision of a regulation or order issued under this title.'

"SEC. 117. At the end of section 403, add the following new paragraph:

"'Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, administration of salary stabilization for executive, administrative, supervisory, and professional personnel shall be under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, under stabilization policies promulgated by the Economic Stabilization Administrator. The term "supervisory personnel" as used herein shall have the same meaning as the term "supervisor" as defined by the "Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947", and the terms "executive", "administrative", and 'professional" shall have the same meaning as the corresponding terms as defined in existing regulations of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division for the purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act.'

"SEC. 118. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 411. No person shall be required under this act to furnish any reports or other information with respect to sales of materials or services at prices which are below ceiling, if such person certifies to the President that such sales were made at such prices.'

"SEC. 119. Section 503 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'It is the sense of the Congress that, by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled, and the Congress therefor requests the President to invoke immediately the national emergency provisions (sections 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage.'

"SEC. 120. (a) Title VI of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby repealed. The table of contents in the first section of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out 'Title VI. Control of consumer and real estate credit,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Title VI. [Repealed]'.

"(b) Subsection (c) of section 109 of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951, which amends section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'and provide for extending natural gas for house heating to amputee veterans, other hardship cases, and totally disabled individuals.'

"(c) Section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) After the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952, no voluntary program or agreement for the control of credit shall be approved or carried out under this section.'

"SEC. 121. Section 701 (c) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the colon at the end of the first sentence thereof, and adding the following: 'during such period:'.

"SEC. 122. Section 705 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"'(f) Any person subpenaed under this section shall have the right to make a record of his testimony and to be represented by counsel.'

"SEC. 123. The first sentence of section 707 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out the word 'his.'

"SEC. 124. Section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereto the following new subsection:

"'(d) No action for the recovery of any cooperative payment made to a cooperative association by a Market Administrator under an invalid provision of a milk marketing order issued by the Secretary of the Agriculture pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 shall be maintained unless such action is brought by producers specifically named as party plaintiffs to recover their respective share of such payments within 90 days after the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952 with respect to any cause of action heretofore accrued and not otherwise barred, or within 90 days after accrual with respect to future payments, and unless each claimant shall allege and prove (1) that he objected at the hearing to the provisions of the order under which such payments were made and (2) that he either refused to accept payments computed with such deduction or accepted them under

protest to either the Secretary or the Administrator. The district courts of the United States shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all such actions regardless of the amount involved. This subsection shall not apply to funds held in escrow pursuant to court order. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, no termination date shall be applicable to this subsection.'

"SEC. 125. (a) Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of secton 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out '1952' and inserting in lieu thereof '1953.'

"(b) Subsection (a) of section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out '1952' and inserting in lieu thereof '1953.'

"SEC. 126. Subsection (b) of section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs and of the fairness to consumers of the prices authorized by this act and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration thereof.'

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

"SEC. 201. (a) Subsection (e) of section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1952' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1953.'

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) (1) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of September 30, 1952, except that they shall cease to be in effect at the close of March 31, 1953—

"'(A) in any area which prior to or subsequent to September 30, 1952, is certified under subsection (1) of section 204 of this act as a critical defense-housing area;

"'(B) in any incorporated city, town, or village which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, or village; and

"'(C) in any unincorporated locality in a defense-rental area in which one or more incorporated cities, towns, or villages constituting the major portion of the defense-rental area have made the declaration specified in subparagraph (B) at a time when maximum rents under this title were in effect in such unincorporated locality.

"'(2) Any incorporated city, town, or village which makes the declarations specified in paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken.

"'(3) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect upon the date of a proclamation by the President or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this title is not necessary because of the existence of an emergency, whichever date is the earlier.

"'(4) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) or (3) of this subsection, the provisions of this title and regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit or action with respect to any right or liability incurred prior to the termination date specified in such paragraph.'

"SEC. 202. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(p) Consistent with the other provisions of this act, all affected agencies, departments, and establishments of the Federal Government shall, by July 15, 1952, establish and administer rents and service charges for quarters supplied to Federal employees and members of the Uniformed Services furnished quarters on a rental basis in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Bureau of the Budget: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to housing units under the jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission where Federal rent control is now in effect.'

"SEC. 203. The Director of Defense Mobilization is hereby authorized to appoint a Defense Areas Advisory Committee to advise him in connection with the exercise of any function or authority vested in him by section 204 (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, or section 101 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, or by delegation thereunder, with respect to determining any area to be a critical defense housing area. Any committee so appointed shall consist, in addition to a chairman, of representatives of the Department of Defense, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Office of Rent Stabilization. Any Federal Agency shall, to the fullest practicable extent, furnish such information in its possession to the Defense Areas Advisory Committee as such Committee may request from time to time relevant to its operations.

"SEC. 204. Subsection (1) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraphs:

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

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

"'(3) a substantial shortage of housing required for such defense workers or military personnel exists which has resulted in excessive rent increases and which impeded activities of such defense plant or installation.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The proceedings by which the bill H. R. 8210 was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, RAINS, WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, and TALLE.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks at the conclusion of the debate in Committee of the Whole, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States, on the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes.

The question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill the objection of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is recognized.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to override the veto and pass the bill H. R. 5678, the President's objections notwithstanding. I have gone very carefully over the lengthy veto message, and I have tried very hard to find in this elaborate opus certain points which would lend themselves to discussion, points that would be pertinent to the provisions of H. R. 5678. Unfortunately, it is impossible, because of the fictional and amateurish character of the message. Therefore, in discussing the veto message, I do feel that I am not discussing the Chief Exectuive's specific objections to the legislative measure now before us. I feel that I am discussing certain thoughts propounded by the President's ghost writers who have neglected to do one thing—to read the bill.

More than half of the veto message deals with the question of whether or not the United States needs more immigrants. The answer to the President's ghost writers is in the affirmative. They say that we need more immigrants to enter our country because our population has grown since 1924 when the quota system was established. In other words, the authors of this message believe that the more population a country has the more people it is able to absorb. This is a brand new argument and shall run counter to the internationally accepted theory, according to which underpopulated and not overpopulated countries offer resettlement opportunities for new immigrants.

Without stretching too much the Presidential ghost writer's argument, Italy, India, and Japan, and not Brazil, Canada, and Australia would be best suited to accept more immigrants.

This extravagant theory, coming to us right after the President's Commission found that we were running out of raw materials, provides for a rather strange illustration of the working of the mind of some of the Presidential advisers. As far as I am concerned, I have noticed among the American people very little support for this brand new theory of overpopulating overpopulated countries, and I do not know of any

widespread desire of enlarging our immigration quotas over and above their present size and over and above the considerable number of additional immigrants that we have received and are still receiving, under special emergency enactments of the postwar years. In any event, the President's ghost writers' demographic dissertations have nothing to do with the legislation before us.

As I pointed out earlier this year on several occasions, this bill is not another displaced persons bill. It is designed to be a permanent statute, codifying and revising the hodgepodge of our immigration and nationality laws. Should the American people decide that they want to admit more immigrants, their representatives in Congress would act according to their wishes, but not in connection with this particular legislation. Similarly, should the American people desire to change the time-tested principle of national origins, from which I believe it would be very dangerous to depart, they would so signify to us and we might then act accordingly. I have not heard any such demands except those coming from isolated groups motivated by political and professional considerations.

The message before us points to many good and desirable provisions of the bill. Among them it lists the removal of racial barriers to immigration and naturalization; the removal of discriminations between sexes, and other improvements of the existing law. If the President's veto is sustained, none of these improvements will be written into the law. The old people of Japanese ancestry, 85,000 of them, whose sons covered themselves with glory on the battlefield of the last war, fighting and dying for the United States, these old people will not become citizens of the United States, and they will continue to face difficulties even in holding to their property in the several States. This, despite the fact that every one of them is legally in the United States and cannot be deported.

If the President's veto is sustained, several thousands of Chinese children of American citizens would remain stranded in Hong Kong under the constant threat of being captured by Chinese Communists and brought up to be our enemies.

If the President's veto is sustained, several thousands of Americans of Italian ancestry who voted in Italian elections in order to help us defeat the Communists will not see their citizenship restored.

If the President's veto is sustained, the American girl who marries an Italian or a Greek, or an Indian or a Japanese, will not be able to bring her husband to the United States.

If the President's veto is sustained, the GI in Japan or in Korea will not be permitted to bring his oriental wife into this country.

If the President's veto is sustained, the homeless and abandoned Korean and Japanese children whose plight has appealed to the big-hearted American boys who prompted their families to adopt them, will be barred from entering the country of their adoption.

If the President's veto is sustained, Communist propaganda in the Far East will be given a new shot in the arm by being permitted to spread the word that we intend to keep the orientals out and that the words of friendship we addressed to them remain just empty slogans.

In that connection I would like to read a paragraph from a letter that I received from General MacArthur bearing date May 23, 1949, in which the general stated:

> The gravity of the issue demands that American policy governing international relationships be raised to the highest moral plane and attuned realistically to a course of broad statesmanship and enlightened vision. * * * The action you advocate is based upon just that type of statesmanship. It completes rectification of a past wrong and gives honor where honor has been well earned and is due. It renews in peace bonds of fraternal understanding and mutual confidence welded in the crucible of war and reaffirms our desire to extend these bonds to embrace all of the peoples of the earth. It repudiates the concept which holds to the superiority of some over the inferiority of others.

We should not permit this to happen, and we should not permit the veto to stand, thus jeopardizing both our domestic and international relations.

As I said in the beginning, I do not know who the President's ghost writers are, but I do find in the veto message most of the statements made by certain persons and certain groups whose motives in fighting this legislation are highly questionable, if not suspicious. On the other hand, I do know that every Government agency charged with the administration of our immigration and nationality laws, the Department of Justice, the Department of State, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, have strongly recommended the enactment of this bill.

I do know that many patriotic American organizations, including the American Legion, the American Federation of Labor—and in that connection I would like to point out that according to an article that appeared in the Star last week the CIO branded this legislation as being antilabor. If this bill is antilabor, then north is south, and east is west.

The American Federation of Labor participated in the drafting of the bill, and they have stated that for the first time in the history of our immigration laws steps have been taken to protect the American worker.

More than that, in this same letter the CIO said that this legislation could be used to punish labor leaders. I found a case reported in the Southeast Reporter in which there is a very short definition of punishment:

> Punishment in a legal sense is any pain, penalty, suffering, or confinement inflicted upon a person by the authority of the law, and the judgment and sentence of a court for some crime or offense committed by him or for his omission of a duty enjoined by law. (*State* v. *Pope* (60 S. E. 234, 236 and 79 S. C. 87,).)

What crimes or offenses have labor leaders committed that makes them falsely brand this legislation as antilabor?

In addition to the organizations I have mentioned, there is the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Please bear that in mind because there is a Catholic clergyman who has been buttonholing Members of Congress all days trying to influence them improperly, if you please. But the National Catholic Welfare Conference endorses this particular bill.

All associations of our shipping and airlines, as well as the Japanese-American Citizens League and the Chinese-American organizations, have recommended its enactment.

The main purpose of the strengthening of our immigration laws was to give the executive branch a better instrument to protect the security of our country and our citizens. The loopholes in our old statutes have gradually become larger and larger, so that while fighting communism abroad we actually became powerless in fighting its infiltration into our own country. I believe that the Congress is under the obligation—under a mandate—to provide for better protection of our country from subversives, gamblers, narcotic peddlers, stowaways, ship jumpers, and foreign agents who know not only too well how to slip into and remain in our country.

There is no question that under the Constitution and under hundreds of court decisions the Congress has the power to provide for such protection.

Instead of following the presidential ghost writers' example and indulge in writing fiction into veto messages, let me quote in that respect a few court decisions.

The power of Congress to control immigration stems from the sovereign authority of the United States as a Nation and from the constitutional power of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations—*Chae Chan Ping* v. *United States* (130 U. S. 581 (1889)); *Edye* v. *Robertson, Collector* (112 U. S. 580 (1884)).

Every sovereign nation has power, inherent in sovereignty and essential to self-preservation, to forbid entrance of foreigners within its dominions, or to admit them only in such cases and upon such conditions as it may see fit to prescribe—*Nishimura Ekiu* v. *United States* (142 U. S. 651, 659 (1892)).

Congress may exclude aliens altogether or prescribe terms and conditions upon which they may come into or remain in this country—*Fok Young Yo* v. *United States* (185 U. S. 296 (1902)).

The power and authority of the United States, as an attribute of sovereignty, either to prohibit or regulate immigration of aliens, are plenary and Congress may choose such agencies as it pleases to carry out whatever policy or rule of exclusion it may adopt, and, so long as such agencies do not transcend limits of authority or abuse discretion reposed in them, their judgment is not open to challenge or review by courts—*Kaorn Yamataya* v. *Fisher* (189 I. S. 86 (1903)).

It has been settled by repeated decision that Congress has power to exclude

any and all aliens from the United States, to prescribe the terms and conditions on which they may come in or on which they remain after having been admitted, to establish the regulations for deporting such aliens as have entered in violation of law or who are here in violation of law, and to commit the enforcing of such laws and regulations to executive officers—*In re Kosopud et al.* (272 F. 330 (1920)).

It has been repeatedly held that the right to exclude or to expel all aliens or any class of aliens, absolutely or upon certain conditions, in war or in peace, is an inherent and inalienable right of every sovereign and independent nation, essential to its safety, its independence, and its welfare; that this power to exclude and to expel aliens, being a power affecting international relations, is vested in the political departments of the Government, and is to be regulated by treaty or by act of Congress and to be executed by the executive authority according to the regulations so established, except so far as the judicial department has been authorized by treaty or by statute, or is required by the paramount law of the Constitution to intervene—*Colyer* v. *Skeffington* (265 F. 17 (1920)).

The United States may exclude any alien for any reason whatsoever, such as the Government's dislike of the alien's political or social ideas, or because he belongs to groups which are likely to become public charges, or for other similar reasons—*United States* v. *Parson* (22 F. Supp. 149 (1938)).

Although an alien who had acquired residence in this country was entitled to the same protection of life, liberty, and property as a citizen, he acquired no vested right to remain and the Government has power to deport him if, in the judgment of Congress, public interests so required, and such power is not dependent upon the existence of statutory conditions as to his right to remain at the time he became a resident—*United States* v. *Sui Joy* (240 F. 392 (1917)).

An alien resident in the United States may be deported for any reason which Congress has determined will make his residence here inimical to the best interests of our Government—*Skeffington* v. *Katzeff* (277 F. 129 (1922)).

In the more recent decisions on March 10, 1952—Harisiades against Shaughnessy, Mascitti against McGrath, and Coleman against McGrath—Justice Jackson cited 11 Supreme Court decisions sustaining the sovereign nation's power to terminate its hospitality to an alien who failed to comply with the laws of the land of his adoption.

Said Justice Jackson:

> It is a weapon of defense and reprisal confirmed by international law as a power inherent in every sovereign State. Such is the traditional power of the Nation over the alien, and we leave the law on the subject as we find it.

Regarding the President's ghost wrters' complaint that certain provisions of this legislation are applicable to the deportation of subversives, this is what Justice Jackson had to say:

> During all the years since 1920 Congress has maintained a standing admonition to aliens, on pain of deportation, not to become members of any organization that advocates overthrow of the United States by force and violence, a category repeatedly held to include the Communist Party. These aliens violated that prohibition and incurred liability to deportation. They were not caught unawares by a change of law.

Regarding the President's ghost writers' complaint about the constitutionality of the other provisions of this bill, Justice Reed, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of Carlson against Landon—March 10, 1952—cited five Supreme Court decisions to sustain the following finding:

> The power to expell aliens, being essentially a power of the political branches of Government, the legislative and executive, may be exercised entirely through executive officers, "with such opportunity for judicial review of their action as Congress may see fit to authorize or permit." This power is, of course, subject to judicial intervention under the "paramount law of the Constitution."

This judicial intervention has been fully preserved in the bill presently before us. So have been other rights and privileges of the alien foreign-born and native-born citizens.

Notwithstanding the fiction contained in the veto message, all existing statutes governing the loss of United States citizenship have been liberalized, and I want to stress the words "all of them"—those relative to loss of citizenship by dual nationals as well as those relative to children of American citizens born abroad.

The paragraphs of the veto message which discuss these provisions of the bill prove once more what I said at the outset, that the ghost writers simply neglected to acquaint themselves with the provisions of the proposed law before they advised the President to disregard the recommendations of all his executive agencies and succumb to pressures motivated by political interests.

After having spent close to 4 years in studying and drafting this law, its authors, supported by every one of the administrative agencies working in the field of immigration and naturalization, recommended the passage of this legislation and now they most sincerely recommend that it be passed again, the Presidential "illadvisers" notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to address this group on this veto. However, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, having given voice to his views whereby he took the President to task for, shall I say, having what might be deemed the temerity in vetoing this bill, I feel it incumbent upon myself to say a few words in support of the President.

The President exercised his discretion. I believe he acted with fortitude, with integrity, and with wisdom, as he saw fit. The President's motive in vetoing this bill must be deemed above reproach. His views are above suspicion.

Even those of Catholic faith have the right to present their views for or against this veto. All faiths have the right to do this and they should not be castigated. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has somewhat offended against the preservation of the right of protest.

I can understand very well the perturbation of mind of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has labored long and assiduously on this bill. He feels a keen rebuff. I do not think that warrants, however, the severity and the bitterness, shall I say, of his denunciation of the President. I think he should take it in his stride. We cannot win at all times. In this work with which we are confronted here we meet with many rebuffs and frustrations, but there come times when we have victories and it compensates us for all our disappointments. He is disappointed. His disappointment should not warp his judgment.

Ghost writing, which he attacks, is apparently essential in the busy life of any President. Turn the mirror upon yourselves. I do not think there is a Member in this House who has not had at some time or other a ghost writer. I venture that there is not a Member of this House who has not at some time or other been at least aided and given some comfort by others in the writing of his speeches. It may be only a matter of degree, that is all. But when you take the multifarious duties of a President, it is almost impossible for him to write every speech or every observation that comes from his pen. He must have the aid and the counsel of others. Consider his herculean tasks, his varied pursuits, the intensity of his work and you readily see that continual speech writing requires considerable assistance

The test is: "are the remarks embraced to the President." If so, they are his. The veto is the veto of the President, beyond all doubt. It has been the practice of many Presidents to have ghost writers. I just read Judge Rosenman's book about 20 years with the President. He spoke of the ghost writing that was involved in many of the presentations of President Roosevelt. Even General Eisenhower has his ghost writer. President Hoover, President Coolidge, and President Taft all had their ghost writers, and they received such aid and comfort from many of their counselors in that regard.

The strictures laid on the President are rather heavy and I think a bit unfair. All wisdom does not reside either in the President or in the gentleman from Pennsylvania or any Member of the House, for that matter. We are all endowed with human frailties. I say the President is well within his rights to veto this bill. The disappointment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is understandable, but his heavy handed criticism of the President is not.

The gravamen of the veto was the objection to further imbedding in our statutes what is known as the national origins theory. Most of the veto message is in opposition to the national origins theory. I believe that theory is out moded and should have been cast into limbo long since. It stems from a sort of claustrophobia, xenophobia, or chauvinism, popular at the end of the last century but which seems to animate many of the people in this land and a

goodly portion of the membership of this House. Too many people believe aliens have horns and that they are the very embodiment of the devil.

The bill vetoed continues to divide the immigration pie in a very unfair and unrealistic manner. We allow something like a total of 154,000 aliens to come into this country yearly, and how do we divide that pie? We give almost half of it to Great Britain. What does Great Britain do? It thumbs its nose at us and says, "We do not want to come to the United States, we do not want to use your immigration quota numbers."

Then what do we do? We continue the hoax. We continue, shall I say, the lie. We continue the fake, as it were. We say we give to Britain almost half the quota, sixty-eight-thousand-odd. They hardly use any of the numbers, and all those numbers go down the drain. That is to the great disadvantage of the aliens who seek to come here from other lands, particularly those from southern and eastern Europe, from Spain and from Greece and from Italy. The President said: "Do not let the British quota numbers go to waste. Assign unused numbers to aliens anxious to come to us, but who cannot because the quotas of their country of origin are ridiculously if tragically small."

Why do we discriminate with pitifully small quotas for those countries in southern and eastern Europe and give to Germany over 25,000 quota numbers, and give to Great Britain all those numbers that I have mentioned, whereas Great Britain does not want to use them? Why so generous to Germany? And so parsimonious to Italy? Why do we continue that course? The President wisely pointed all that out in his veto message.

Names of worthy people from southern and eastern Europe, who are discriminated against by the bill vetoed are part of the warp and woof of American life. These names are found on baseball rosters, in the lists of Congressmen, and governors.

I suggest that if you look at the casualty lists coming from Korea you will see what? Only British or German names? Indeed no. You will see many names of those who came from southern and eastern Europe, Polish names, Hungarian names, Croatian names, Italian names, Greek names, and Turkish names. These diverse names belong to honored dead and wounded. Why should their people be so discriminated against by virtue of the national origins theory, against which the President very properly inveighed, a theory which also flies in the face of our foreign policy?

In one breath we say we wish to hold out a helping hand to you people in Italy, and you people in Greece, and you people in Spain, and you people in other parts of southern and eastern Europe. And in the other breath we do all in our power to wound their sensibilities, to curb their spirit and injure their feelings when it comes to immigration quotas. The President very properly pointed that out. In effect he said they are just as good as the British or the Germans. These people who come from those parts have America born in them—most of them. I do not ask the question whether a man was born in America. I ask the question, "Is America born in you?" Benedict Arnold was born in this country, but America was not born in him. Earl Browder was born in this country, but America was not born in him. Carl Schurz was not born in this country, but America was born in him. Alexander Hamilton was not born in America. America was born in him. Vincent Impelliteri, our great mayor of the city of New York, was born in Italy, but America was born in him. That should be the test. So many Italians and Greeks despite America being born in them are kept out. But this immigration bill which was passed by this House and vetoed by the President, flies in the face of that theory of Americanism.

Those who sponsored this bill, and many members of the House, are forgetful that we built our great country because we siphoned off the best of the brain and the best of the brawn of all peoples of Europe everywhere—not from just a few countries but from all countries of Europe—as a result of which we have the highest standards of living that civilization has ever seen. But this bill again flies in the face of all that. It turns the clock backward, and the President in his wisdom very properly points all that out in his veto message.

What do we do with reference to the escapees coming out from behind the iron curtain or from behind the bamboo curtain? In one breath we say, "Come in, we want to entice you to come from behind the iron curtain or the bamboo curtain." Then when they ask to come into this country and they go to our consuls in the far-spread cities of the world, and when one of them says, "I have come out of Russia," or another says "I have come out of Poland," or "I have come out of Czechoslovakia, or Yugoslavia, or Rumania, or Hungary." What does the consul say: "No soap. You will have to wait." "How long must I wait?" "You must wait until your quota number is reached." "How long will that be?" "Maybe 10 years, maybe 20 years." Meanwhile what are they to do?

Well, in the case of some of the small countries of Europe, the wait might be over 100 years. We have mortgaged the quotas of some countries for so many years. These are some of the reasons assigned for the veto. The President, indeed, was well within his rights in vetoing this bill.

The praiseworthy provisions of the bill regarding the naturalization of our Japanese residents and the entry of oriental spouses and children, could be readily and speedily enacted in a separate measure on which, I am certain, we could all quickly agree.

The President himself recommends such action.

The veto does not foreclose these essential remedies.

Furthermore, the President properly recommends the setting up of a commission to make a profound study of our immigration and naturalization laws.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that those who vote against the President's veto will do so thinking they serve the best interests of the United States. I hope they are right. But I think they are wrong. I will vote to sustain the President's veto.

The greatest fear of man seems to be man.

I recall James Matthew Barrie's Admirable Crichton. In England, the hero was a butler. On a shipwrecked island, he was a regular guy, cock of the walk, real Joe.

That is America. Afraid of no one. It has made it possible for each of us to be "Admirable Crichtons."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, surely nobody questions the right of the President to veto this bill. The think which a great many of us do question is the wisdom of his vetoing it, especially at a time like the present. Today we have thousands and thousands of American boys in Korea whose very lives depend upon the faith in us and good will toward us of the Koreans among whom they are living and fighting. The President's veto perpetuates a situation whereby in our immigration laws those Koreas are officially insulted and stigmatized as biologically inferior beings. What effort do you suppose news of the President's veto has on our allies in Korea?

We have lost a good part of continental Asia to Communist control. Everybody knows what we have done in the last year to try to keep on our side what can be a bulwark of freedom in that part of the world—Japan. She is the third best workshop in the world. Rusisa now controls plenty of manpower. She has territory. She has raw materials. What does she need? She needs a workshop. And there it is—Japan, the best in Asia. To keep it on our side and out of Russia's hands, we must depend on people whom the President chooses today to declare unfit for even one of them, no matter how gifted or cultured, to come into the United States as an immigrant because he is not of the white, the black, or the red race. That is what existing law provides, and the President's veto keeps it as it is.

We want and need the people of Asia to stand with us at a time when things are not going too well—and then our President slaps them in the face.

Mr. Speaker, racial discrimination in our dealings with other peoples is the weakest spot in America's armor. Make no mistake about the importance of this issue. The colored peoples around the world outnumber the white peoples two to one. They can outwork and undereat any white men that ever lived. They will outwait him and outsuffer him and outendure him; and they will outbreed him. They will win out, if our enemies succeed in uniting them against us, and I fear they will if the white man continues much longer on his statute books immigration laws that publicly discriminate against friendly peoples by denying, with certain exceptions, any quota whatsoever for those whose skins happen to be yellow or brown.

Those are the very people on whose faith in us, whose friendship for us, whose sense of unity with us the lives of our own sons in Korea, Japan, and other parts of the Far East depend, and on whom our future security in the Pacific basin depends, and on whom ultimately the survival of this Republic may depend.

America formerly had a privileged position in the world. Other countries got into conflicts and we stood on the side and watched until we determined where out interests lay, and then we threw in our strength on this side or the other, and that usually tipped the scales.

That fortunate day has gone. Today we are not an observer, we are one of the two main contenders. On one side of the balance is the Soviet Union with 800,000,000 people under its domination. On the other side is the free world, with the 800,000,000 people of the Western Hemisphere, Western Europe, the Mediterranean area, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and a few others. Who controls the balance of power between these two contenders, locked in mortal combat? The other 750,000,000 in the world. Where do they live? They live in Asia. They are the peoples branded as inferior and unworthy human beings under the present laws whose discrimination this bill is designed to correct. And the President has vetoed it.

They live in Korea, Japan, southeast Asia, and across South Asia to Iran. These are the 750,000,000 people who control the balance of power in the world today—and whom the President chooses to affront anew. What happens to them in the immediate future depends in no small degree, in my opinion, on what the United States does; but what happens to the United States in the long run depends on which way those people go. Will it be with the Communists who offer all sorts of lies and fake and fraudulent promises of racial equality? Or with us, who, while not pretending to any perfection and not denying the inequities that still exist, are nevertheless trying, step by step, to correct them?

Is it not better to accept the bill with its real gains, even though it does not correct all that many believe to be inequities, than to reject the great forward steps which it represents in the very areas where we are sustaining our most serious losses? Is it sensible to reject those forward steps just because the bill does not achieve the Kingdom of Heaven on earth?

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to produce positively all the good and justice and brotherhood that we would like to have in the world, but the least we can do is to remove the negative acts of injustice that are in our immigration and naturalization statutes today. That is what this bill does that the President has vetoed.

In his message the President said the bill "repudiates our basic religious concepts, our belief in the brotherhood of man."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is the President's veto that repudiates our basic religious concepts, our belief in the brotherhood of man, because it keeps our statutes as they are, with hundreds of millions of people in those crucial areas still outlawed because of the color or the pigment of their skin. I cannot believe that in a time of such crisis and such peril, when such gigantic issues are hanging in the balance, we will fail to override the President's veto. We must make clear to watching millions that the representatives of the people of the United States believe in trying to correct things that are inequitable; that we want to improve relations between our country and all the peoples in the world who want to be free; and that because we believe the action of our President to be mistaken and short-sighted, the representatives of the people, as is certainly within their rights, take this action to make this bill the official law of the land.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the veto message of President Truman on H. R. 5678 presents convincing reasons why the President should have vetoed this bill and why the House should sustain his veto.

Among other reasons, the President stressed strongly, and properly so, the unfairness of the so-called national origins clause of the 1924 immigration act as our basic law in determining quotas for other countries.

While the national-origins clause as a basis of our quota allocations was incorporated into the 1924 law, it was suspended from time to time by the Congress until 1929, when it finally became effective.

This is rather clear evidence that the very Members of the Congress who passed the immigration law of 1924 entertained serious doubts in relation to the wisdom, soundness, or fairness of the national-origins clause as the vital part of our organic immigration law in determining quotas that the various countries of the world should have.

I remember well that the first speech I made in the House as a new Member was against the national-origins clause.

And now, over 32 years later, President Truman in a ringing veto message, calls attention to this very clause, its unfairness and the fact that this quota system—always based upon assumptions at variance with our American ideals—is long since out of date and more than ever unrealistic in the face of the present world conditions.

This clause was unrealistic when enacted into law in 1924, and when it became effective in 1929.

It is equally unrealistic now. Its result, if not objective, in 1924 was to reduce far below what was fair and equitable immigration from certain countries of Europe. At that time one of these countries was Ireland, as were the countries of all of southern Europe. The result, if not the purpose, on the other hand, was to give other countries a much higher quota than the rule of fairness and equity called for.

I opposed the national-origins clause before it became operative in law because I considered it unfair, contrary to American fairness, and inconsistent with American ideals. It brought about a quota system that was an insult to many racial groups that made up our people.

For we must remember, heretofore and now, Americans are not a race; they are a people.

Any effort to base a quota system upon such a concept as the national-origins clause is wrong from the outset. While it must be tolerated and adhered to as long as it is the law, the fact that it has been in operation for 32 years does not make it right.

President Truman has made a ringing contribution to a restoration of American idealism and justice in relation to our quota system by his condemnation and repudiation of the national-origins clause.

The bill is the result of 4 years of study and effort by the members of the committee who considered the same. The veto of the President is not a reflection on them. The drafting of a codification or of a new immigration law is a very difficult task. There is much good in the present bill.

However, in addition to the objectionable national-origins clause there are other provisions of an objectionable nature that justifies the action taken by President Truman in vetoing this bill.

For the reasons stated by the President, his veto should be sustained by the House of Representatives.

I include in my remarks a speech I made in the House on February 14, 1929, and appearing in volume 70, part 4, on pages 3472, 3473, 3474, 3475, 3476, and 3477) of the RECORD of 1929:

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, the subject that I am going to discuss is quite different from the full and able speech which has just been rendered by the distinguished Member [Mr. Garber], who has just preceded me and which I found very interesting. I might say in passing that I have listened to the gentleman on two different occasions and his profound knowledge of the subject that he has discussed has made a marked impression upon me.

One of the most important questions remaining to be determined before this session of Congress is over, is what action will be taken from the repeal, deference, or going into operation of the national-origins clause of the immigration law of 1924. The interest in this question is not confined to any one section of our country; neither is it confined to any one of the so-called nationals that constitute our inhabitants. The action of Congress on this question is being watched closely.

At the outset it must be borne in mind that the controversy over the national-origins clause of the Immigration Act has been misrepresented so as to be made to appear a controversy over increasing or decreasing numerically the number of immigrants that can come to this country. This misrepresentation is very unfortunate because it gives a false statement of facts. The repeal of the national-origins clause has nothing to do with the question of the number of people that shall be permitted to come here each year. The effort to repeal the national-origins clause has been characterized as an attack upon the immigration law of 1924. It is nothing of the kind. It is, in fact, an effort to prevent the law from being ridiculous.

The national-origins clause is a part of the immigration law of 1924. Nobody seems to

know its real parenthood, although one John B. Trevor, of New York City, who was a captain in the Intelligence Department of the Army, detailed in New York City during the war, appears to claim the credit for it.

I have heard that the Ku Klux Klan claims the credit for conceiving it and securing its adoption as an amendment to the immigration law. I am satisfied, however, that their only knowledge of it was after its adoption in the Senate in 1924, as an amendment to the bill that passed the House, and that thereafter the Ku Klux Klan used it as a means of trying to carry out its purposes by attracting additional members to its ranks. It seems rather hard for me to believe that anything that such an organization might sponsor would receive the favorable consideration of either or both branches of Congress.

It appears from the records of the hearings of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization which reported the 1924 immigration law that the national-origins clause received little, if any, consideration from the committee. It is quite probable—and so far as I can find it is a fact—that it was not presented to the committee for consideration. In any event, when the bill was reported to the House it was not a part thereof, and during debate an amendment was offered in the House which included in substance the provisions of the present law. The amendment was rejected. The House later passed the bill and while under consideration in the Senate, Senator Reed of Pennsylvania, moved the amendment which inserted the present national-origins clause into the bill. Upon its return to the House it was sent to conference, and the House conferees recommended the adoption of the amendment, which action was taken. Whether or not it is correct, I am informed this amendment was reluctantly accepted by the House in order that the whole bill might not fail of passage.

As I have said before, this is to my mind one of the most important questions that confront us today, particularly in view of the fact that we have only a few weeks left in this session of Congress, and during which period it is essential that some affirmative action be taken in order to prevent the operation of this particular clause. To prevent its operation affirmative action must be taken by Congress. There are two ways in which we can take affirmative action, and when I say "we," of course I refer to both branches of Congress. One is by joint resolution deferring its operation and the other is by enacting necessary legislation to repeal its provisions. The other procedure that we may employ is the passive, inactive negative, do-nothing method, as a result of which, in accordance with the ruling given by the Attorney General, as I understand it, the President of the United States is compelled on or before April 1 of this year to proclaim the provisions of this clause to be in operation. This means that the quotas established thereunder by the President's commission will become operative July 1, 1929.

That President's commission to which I refer was made up of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce (now President-elect Hoover), and they in turn each appointed two members of their respective departments as a joint committee to make a more thorough investigation of the matter.

I realize that men have different opinions and different views on this question. I appreciate the fact they have the right to entertain their views if they are honestly arrived at, and naturally every Member of this House arrives at honest views, so far as my opinion is concerned. I do not use the above language with the intent that you might infer that I have any feeling to the contrary, because you, like myself, are actuated by a desire to render that degree of public service in this body which you feel the best interests of the country demand and which is in accordance with your conscience. [Applause.]

I also considered it my duty to vote as my conscience dictated on any matters which came before any legislative body of which I was a member, and the question of party affiliation never influenced me unless a party principle or responsibility was involved. In that case I followed, and will follow, the principles enunciated by the Democratic Party, because the incorporation of them into law will be for the best interests of the people.

It is my belief that a public servant should represent all elements and political creeds in his district. So, in approaching this question, let me say that I recognize that men in both political parties differ and differ honestly.

I am going to try to impress upon you the fact that the basis of the determination, as provided in the national origins clause, so-called, is almost impossible of ascertainment. It is left to the field of conjecture.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I will.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not a fact you have to go back 300 years to determine the statistics as to national origin?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And is it not a fact we have not the statistics available?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Exactly. That is in part correct. The basis prescribed by this clause for the establishing of quotas of countries affected has as its object a definite purpose which is unfair and discriminatory, and a reflection upon elements of past immigrants, now Americans, some for many generations, that have contributed so much toward the building up and progress of our country. The basis for computation is also uncertain and leaves the calculation, whichever it may be, to the field of conjecture. The clause provided a method of calculation which is incapable of ascertainment without resort to guesswork. Any such basis is bound to result in quotas which will be discriminatory, if not insulting, in their character. A careful examination of testimony presented to different committees, also books written by some of the proponents, and addresses made on different occasions by some of them justify the assertion that the underlying motive is un-American.

If we are going to establish an immigration policy, let it be definite. Let it be certain. The expression of the principle should be definite and certain, whether it be a closed immigration policy, a restrictive immigration policy, or a partially restrictive policy as set forth in the 1924 act.

Let it be definite and certain, but not left to uncertainty; and let both branches of Congress determine with certainty not only the expression of the principle we believe in, but with certainty as to the quotas the different quota countries shall be entitled to. Not only does Congress, by permitting the national-origins clause to go into operation, evade the duty of making the quotas themselves, but it passes the responsibility to the President's commission, composed of three secretaries, and they in turn pass it on to Doctor Hill and his associates.

I might say at this time that I intend to follow the suggestion made by Governor Smith in his statement after the last election, in which he urged the Democratic Members of Congress to support President-elect Hoover during his term of office on all legislation that relates to the general welfare and progress of the people.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I hope at some not distant time the gentleman will inform the House what the fundamental principles of the Democratic Party are.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think those fundamental principles are so well known that the average man knows them, but I shall be glad to enlighten the gentleman out in the lobby some time.

The first indication of the unreliability and uncertainty of the basis of determination as provided in the national-origins clause was the postponement of its operation until July 1, 1927, in order that the quotas might be established. In order to regulate immigration up to the going into effect of the national-origins clause it was provided in the 1924 act—"that the annual quota of any nationality shall be 2 percent of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality resident in continental United States as determined by the United States census of 1890, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100."

This, like the national-origins clause, only governed quota countries. The practical operation of the present law meant that 164,000 immigrants constituted 2 percent of our foreign-born population as of 1890, and were allotted among the several European countries in accordance with the terms of this provision. Whether one believes in the policy of restrictive immigration or not, there is no question but what the original provision is at least definite and certain in its theory and operation. While the national-origins clause is certain as to the number of immigrants admissible each year from Europe, which is 153,000, every other provision thereof is unreliable, uncertain, and therefore inequitable.

This would be particularly so in its operation, if it ever goes into effect. I want to call to the attention of the Members that in accordance with the provisions of the national-origins clause the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, as a joint board, each appointed two representatives to try and perform the impossible task therein provided. It is fair to infer from all correspondence made by them that they approached this task with the realization of its difficulty of approximate ascertainment, and the fact that, in the main, they would have to rely upon conjecture. The results have clearly shown that to be the fact. Their work has been tirelessly and unselfishly rendered and yet their reports and findings are the strongest evidence of the human impossibility of performing such a task. In their report on December 16, 1926, will be found the following:

"We have found our task by no means simple, but we are carrying it out by methods which we believe to be statistically correct, utilizing the data that are available in accordance with what seems to us to be the intent and meaning of the law. We have not completed our work, but the figures which we are submitting for your information, though provisional and subject to revision, indicate approximately what the final results will be."

What stronger evidence of uncertainty?

Accompanying this report were the quotas which they had determined in accordance with the law, and which, while not complete and subject to revision, indicate approximately what the final results will be. These are not my words, but the words of Dr. Hill and his associates.

Thereafter, the operation of the law was deferred until July 1, 1928, and on February 27, 1928, other quotas were recommended by Dr. Hill and his associates. Having in mind the statement above quoted from report of 1927, that the 1927 quotas "indicated approximately what the final results will be," a comparison of these two quotas is very interesting and convincing as showing

further the grave uncertainty of the basis of determination.

Country or area	(1) National-origin quotas submitted Feb. 27, 1928	(2) National-origin quotas submitted Jan. 7, 1927	(3) Present quotas, based on 1890 foreign-born population
Armenia	100	----------	124
Australia, including Papua, etc.	100	100	121
Austria	1,639	1,486	785
Belgium	1,328	410	512
Czechoslovakia	2,726	2,248	3,073
Danzig, Free City of	137	122	228
Denmark	1,234	1,044	2,789
Estonia	100	109	124
Finland	568	559	471
France	3,308	3,837	3,954
Germany	24,908	23,428	51,227
Great Britain, Northern Ireland	65,894	73,039	34,007
Greece	312	367	100
Hungary	1,181	967	473
Irish Free State	17,427	13,862	28,567
Italy, including Rhodes, etc.	5,989	6,091	3,845
Latvia	243	184	142
Lithuania	492	494	344
Netherlands	3,083	2,421	1,648
Norway	2,403	2,267	6,453
Poland	6,090	4,978	5,982
Portugal	457	290	503
Rumania	311	516	603
Russia, European and Asiatic	3,540	4,781	2,248
Spain	305	674	131
Sweden	3,399	3,259	9,561
Switzerland	1,614	1,198	2,081
Syria and the Lebanon (French)	125	100	100
Turkey	233	233	100
Yugoslavia	739	777	671
Total	[1] 153,685	[1] 153,541	[1] 164,647

[1] Including 37 minimum quotas of 100 each.

As a further indication of the uncertainty that existed in the minds of the President's Commission, I quote a letter to the President under date of January 3, 1927:

JANUARY 3, 1927.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to the provisions of sections 11 and 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924, we have the honor to transmit herewith the report of the subcommittee appointed by us for the purpose of determining the quota of each nationality in accordance with the provisions of said sections.

The report of the subcommittee is self-explanatory, and, while it is stated to be a preliminary report, yet it is believed that further investigation will not substantially alter the conclusions arrived at.

Although this is the best information we have been able to secure, we wish to call attention to the reservations made by the committee and to state that in our opinion the statistical and historical information available raises grave doubts as to the whole value of these computations as a basis for the purposes intended. We therefore cannot assume responsibility for such conclusions under these circumstances.

Yours faithfully,

FRANK B. KELLOGG,
Secretary of State,
Department of State.
HERBERT HOOVER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce.
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor.

Furthermore, on February 25, 1928, the President's Commission in transmitting the 1928 quotas above referred to said:

"We wish it clear that neither we individually nor collectively are expressing any opinion on the merits or demerits of this system of arriving at the quotas. We are simply transmitting the calculations made by the departmental committee in accordance with the act."

An analysis of the report of Dr. Hill and his associates, dated December 16, 1926, showing the manner upon which calculations were determined is further evidence of the impossibility of a fair determination, particularly in determining what portion of our white population of 1920 is derived from the "old native stock" of 1790. The records of immigration giving the number of immigrants arriving annually from each foreign country from 1820 to 1920 was in part relied upon. It is a well-known fact that a good portion of those who came from southern Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and Ulster came on vessels that started from an English port and were listed as emigrating from England. This was particularly true prior to 1870. In the case of Scotland, Wales, and Ulster it makes no difference, because their quotas under this law will be combined into one, but this situation seriously affects the quota that southern Ireland would be entitled to. Such a situation is further evidence of the grave uncertainty of a determination that will not be discriminatory.

The above immigration quotas were printed for the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and column No. 1 is the report for 1928, column 2 the report for 1927, both made by Doctor Hill and his associates, and column 3 is the quotas under the present law.

Columns 1 and 2 relate to the national origins clause and the marked difference between them in the short period of 1 year seems to me to be inescapable evidence of the uncertainty of ascertainment.

A comparison will show that under the quotas that will be established if the national-origins clause goes into effect that Germany will be reduced from 51,227 to 24,908; Irish Free State from 28,567 to 17,427; Norway from 6,453 to 2,403; Sweden from 9,561 to 3,399; Switzerland from 2,081 to 1,614; Denmark from 2,789 to 1,234; France from 3,954 to 3,308; while Great Britain and northern Ireland will be increased from 34,007 to 65,894; Austria from 785 to 1,639; Belgium from 512 to 1,328; Hungary from 473 to 1,181; Italy from 3,845 to 5,989; Netherlands from 1,648 to 3,083; Russia from 2,248 to 3,540. These are the most important changes that will occur. As I have said before, the strongest evidence of uncertainty is the difference between the report of 1927 and 1928.

Another year has gone by since the last computation was submitted and which will be the quotas if the national-origins clause goes into effect. It is fair to assume that if a report had been made this year by Dr. Hill and his associates, that further changes would have been noted.

In passing I want it clearly understood that I have the greatest of admiration for Dr. Hill and his associates. They are performing what must be to them an unpleasant task, because of its impossibility of performance. They have performed their work unselfishly and tirelessly. They are simply trying to carry out the law. It is clear from their reports, so far as I am concerned, that they realize that the records are so lacking that they had to rely upon conjecture.

It is significant that the only census taken in the United States prior to 1850 was that of 1790. In the 1790 census only the heads of families were reported, and there was no indication of the land of their nativity or of their ancestors.

Dr. Hill and his associates deemed that they would have to depend in the main upon the sounding of names to determine nativity, and he frankly admitted in the House hearings held in 1927 that names may indicate origin from any one of two or more countries. He further said that in the event of the names having an origin from England or Scotland or Ireland, the probabilities were that because of the predominance of the English of foreign birth and descent at that time the census takers designated them as being of English descent.

The census of 1790 showed the white population of the then 17 States was 3,172,444. The following figures show in detail the population of the several States, with an estimate of the strength of the various nationals therein, which, so far as I can ascertain, is based upon guesswork:

White population in 1790 as classified by nationality in ch. IX of A Century of Population Growth, published by the Bureau of the Census in 1909

Nationality as indicated by name	United States		Maine		New Hampshire		Vermont		Massachusetts		Rhode Island	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All nationalities	3,172,444	100.0	96,107	100.0	141,112	100.0	85,072	100.0	373,187	100.0	64,670	100.0
English	2,605,699	82.1	89,515	93.1	132,726	94.1	81,149	95.4	354,528	95.0	62,079	96.0
Scotch	221,562	7.0	4,154	4.3	6,648	4.7	2,562	3.0	13,435	3.6	1,976	3.1
Irish	61,534	1.9	1,334	1.4	1,346	1.0	597	.7	3,732	1.0	459	.7
Dutch	78,959	2.5	279	.3	153	.1	428	.5	373	.1	19	(1)
French	17,619	.6	115	.1	142	.1	153	.3	746	.2	88	.1
German	176,407	5.6	436	.5	----------	--------	35	(1)	75	(1)	33	.1
Hebrew	1,243	(1)	44	(1)	----------	--------	----------	--------	67	(1)	9	(1)
All other	9,421	.3	230	.2	97	.1	148	.2	231	.1	7	(1)

[1] Less than 1/10 of 1 percent.

White population in 1790 as classified by nationality in ch. IX of A Century of Population Growth, published by the Bureau of the Census in 1909—Continued

Nationality as indicated by name	Connecticut		New York		New Jersey		Pennsylvania		Delaware		Maryland	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All nationalities	232,236	100.0	314,366	100.0	169,954	100.0	423,373	100.0	46,310	100.0	208,649	100.0
English	223,437	96.2	245,901	78.2	98,620	58.0	249,656	59.0	39,966	86.3	175,265	84.0
Scotch	6,425	2.8	10,034	3.2	13,156	7.7	49,567	11.7	3,473	7.5	13,562	6.5
Irish	1,589	.7	2,525	.8	12,099	7.1	8,614	2.0	1,806	3.9	5,008	2.4
Dutch	258	.1	50,600	16.1	21,581	12.7	2,623	.6	463	1.0	209	.1
French	512	.2	2,424	.8	3,565	2.1	2,341	.6	232	.5	1,460	.7
German	4	(1)	1,103	.4	15,678	9.2	110,357	26.1	185	.4	12,310	5.9
Hebrew	5	(1)	385	.1	(2)		21	(1)	(2)		626	.3
All other	6	(1)	1,394	.4	5,255	3.1	194	(1)	185	.4	209	.1

	Virginia		North Carolina		South Carolina		Georgia		Kentucky		Tennessee	
All nationalities	442,117	100.0	289,181	100.0	140,178	100.0	52,886	100.0	61,133	100.0	31,913	100.0
English	375,799	85.0	240,309	83.1	115,480	82.4	43,948	83.1	50,802	83.1	26,519	83.1
Scotch	31,391	7.1	32,388	11.2	16,447	11.7	5,923	11.2	6,847	11.2	3,574	11.2
Irish	8,842	2.0	6,651	2.3	3,576	2.6	1,216	2.3	1,406	2.3	734	2.3
Dutch	884	.2	578	.2	219	.2	106	.2	122	.2	64	.2
French	2,653	.6	868	.3	1,882	1.3	159	.3	183	.3	96	.3
German	21,664	4.9	8,097	2.8	2,343	1.7	1,481	2.8	1,712	2.8	894	2.8
Hebrew			1	(1)	85	.1	(2)		(2)		(2)	
All other	884	.2	289	.1	146	.1	53	.1	61	.1	32	.1

[1] Less than 1/10 of 1 percent.
[2] Included in "All other."

As one indication of the uncertainty of relying on the 1790 census I may mention that it does not take into consideration the size of the families and that some nationalities are quite prone to more productivity than others.

In determining the quotas under the national-origins clause the white population of 1920, numbering about 94,000,000, were divided into two groups, one called "old native stock" and the other "immigrant stock." The census of 1790 was taken as the basis for determining what portion of our population in 1920 were descended from the population of 1790. It was determined that 41,000,000 persons in the United States in 1920 were descendents of the "old native stock." Bearing the fact in mind that all persons who arrived here since 1790, or their descendents, are described as "immigrant stock," and looking through the roll of the Members of Congress it is apparent to me that 80 percent of our membership fall within that class.

When you consider that the first decennial census taken in the United States, outside of the one in 1790, was in 1850; that there are no official records prior to 1790, together with the loss, in the Ellis Island fire in 1896, of records of immigrations that flowed through the great city of New York from 1820 on, the destruction of many historical records by the British, when they occupied the city of Washington in the War of 1812, together with many other matters of consideration, we can then realize the impossibility of establishing quotas which will not be discriminatory to some of our nationals.

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

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not a fact that Dr. Hill testified before the Committee on Immigration that he could only go back about 100 years?

Mr. MCCORMACK. My impression is that Dr. Hill testified that the United States decennial censuses could only go back to 1850; that the records of the ports of entry go back only to about 1820; that is, the immigrants coming into different ports of entry, as distinguished from the facts revealed in the decennial censuses. My observation and study further show that thousands and thousands of immigrants coming from Germany, from Ireland, from Scotland, and from other places were compelled to come over on ships owned by English interests and they were listed as English citizens.

That is not submitted as criticism, but as a piece of evidence. Everything based on conjecture is bound to be discriminatory and offensive to some of our nationals. We are not an English, or an Irish, or a German, or a French nation. We do not want any element to predominate. We are an American Nation. We may have a great feeling of fondness and regard for the land of our forbears, as we should, but above every other consideration we are Americans. The history of the recent war has evidenced the fact that Americanism means the same thing to all of our citizens, irrespective of their national origin—that is, love of flag, country, and that upon which everything that we possess governmentally stands, the Constitution of the United States.

We want Americans. We want the immigrants who come over here—the same as my forbears did two generations ago—to be filled with a love of our institutions. To a certain extent, undoubtedly, they will come here seeking material gain, but in the main they look up to this Government of ours as a land of opportunity. I recognize that conditions might change our immigration policy. That necessity might arise some day when we might consider the advisability of a change, but if we are going to have a change, let it be definite and certain, not only in principle but definite and certain in practice.

Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the fact that this uncertainty exists is further evidenced by the report made by the President's commission, comprised, as I said before, of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce—the then Secretary of Commerce, President-elect Hoover. Not only that, but President-elect Hoover in his acceptance speech said he favored the repeal of the national-origins clause. He recognized the impossibility of human determination in accordance with the basis provided in that law. He recognized the offensiveness of it, and he recognized that this was not bringing into effect in America a new policy with reference to the restriction of immigration, because we have it now. We have it now in the act of 1924. Two percent of the foreign-born population as of 1890 means approximately 164,000 immigrants who are entitled to admission from quota countries in Europe each year, and in turn the number to which each country is entitled is simply a matter of mathematics. That can be arrived at. It is a definite and certain enunciation of a principle, and it naturally follows that there is a definite and certain determination of the quotas.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Can the gentleman tell the House how this national origins was determined, based upon what figures, what the present quota is as based on the act of 1924, and what would be the quota of all nationals under the national-origins clause? Has the gentleman those figures?

Mr. MCCORMACK. As I understand it, the present law permits one hundred and sixty-four thousand and a few odd hundred to come in each year, while the national-origins clause authorizes one hundred and fifty-three and some few hundreds to come in each year. Am I correct?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. MCCORMACK. While the national-origins clause provides a maximum of 150,000, it also provides in addition that certain countries which had no quota before or whose computation would be less than 100, are entitled to the admission of a minimum of 100, and that is the reason why it comes to approximately 153,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I understand it, the gentleman is opposed to the national-origins provision of the present law?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Precisely.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman favor the quota based on the 1890 census? The present law is based on the 1890 census, as I understand.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes; and that is definite and certain.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman favor the 1890 census as a basis, or some other census—the 1910 census or the 1920 census?

Mr. McCORMACK. To be frank with the gentleman, his question goes into something that I did not intend to discuss, and I am equally frank in saying that I am rapidly approaching a mental state where I realize that through necessity we must close this open door and bring about some kind of a restriction. Whether that should be based on the 1910 census or the 1890 census is just a question of policy, based upon the necessity.

I can see where conditions might change; where in the years to come through depletion in our population, because of some great catastrophe, for example—and population increases either by a greater number of births than deaths or by an increase in immigration over emigration; that is the only means through which an increase in population takes place—and I can see where a principle applicable to one period might of necessity be changed when applied to conditions in a different period.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We are legislating for this period.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no objection to the present quota, based on the 1890 census.

Mr. GARBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. GARBER. The proposed change would greatly facilitate the administration of the law, would it not?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman refer to the national-origins clause?

Mr. GARBER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think so.

Mr. GARBER. I mean that the proposed change to a definite basis would greatly facilitate the administration of the law.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman means the law as it exists at present?

Mr. GARBER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman. Now, bearing on that, may I call attention to a statement made by the Commissioner General of Immigration in his annual report for 1925, page 29:

"The bureau feels that the present method of ascertaining the quotas is far more satisfactory than the proposed determination by national origin; that it has the advantages of simplicity and certainty. It is of the opinion that the proposed change will lead to great confusion and result in complexities, and accordingly it is recommended that the pertinent portions of section 11, providing for this revision of the quotas as they now stand, be rescinded."

I am now coming back to 1790. One interesting phase of the evidence about the 1790 census, where it showed a little over 3,000,000 in the 17 States, was in the State of Pennsylvania, as indicating the uncertainty of the 41,000,000 being even approximately a fair estimate of the descendants of the inhabitants as shown in that census.

I do not want to depend upon memory, so let me quote verbatim from the extract which I have here.

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

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. In an article written in 1789, as to the immigration into Pennsylvania in the period around 1749, it was said by the writer that—

"In the summer of the year 1749, 25 sail of large vessels arrived with German passengers alone, which brought about 12,000 souls, some of the ships about 600 each; and in several other years near the same number of these people arrived annually."

This is for only a limited period around 1746, and it is fair to assume that some came before and some came afterward, and yet according to the 1790 census there were only 110,000 Germans in the State of Pennsylvania.

But let us go a step further:

"And in some years nearly as many annually from Ireland."

Yet in 1790 there was only an estimated population of 8,000 in the State of Pennsylvania of either Irish birth or Irish descent.

This is some evidence indicating the uncertainty we have in the records prior to 1790. We have absolutely none from 1790 to 1820, and from 1820 our records of ports of entry are entirely unreliable, first, because of giving their birth in the wrong country, in some cases because of necessity; and, second, because the records in the city of New York were destroyed in the Ellis Island fire in 1896. Furthermore, many historical records of the colonial days were destroyed when the British occupied the city of Washington during the War of 1812.

All of these things have brought about an air of uncertainty so that the basis for the determination of national origins is inadvisable, unwise, inequitable, bound to be discriminatory because in the main it is left to the field of conjecture.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Under the present quota law Ireland receives a quota of 28,000, but under the national origins law, if it takes effect, Ireland only gets 8,000, thereby losing 20,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think there have been two corrections made since that estimate.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is there anything the gentleman can find from his investigation to show how they base that loss, upon what percentage and how far they have gone back?

Mr. McCORMACK. That basis of 8,330 was an estimate given by Captain Trevor, who, I understand, is the parent of this idea, although the Klu Klux Klan claims the credit for it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The parent of this piece of legislation is Mr. Reed. The House never passed it at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; in the Senate it was an amendment offered by Senator Reed, of Pennsylvania, and right there let me say that if this law goes into effect it is those of German birth and descent and those of Irish birth and descent in Pennsylvania that in the main can take the blame.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. May I ask the gentleman another question? Senator Reed takes the credit for it, but he borrowed it from Senator LODGE. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; this Captain Trevor consulted Senator LODGE first, who took him to Senator Reed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. You will find the date given in the hearings as of March 6, 1924.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is just one more reference I might make. During the past few days a representative of the American Legion unfortunately made a reference with which I am not in accord. I am sorry he made this reference, because I am a member of the Legion and the two other members of my family, two younger brothers, who constitute the whole family, are also members of the Legion. This representative made a statement which is offensive to all of our citizens, and I hope sincerely that the Legion members throughout the country who might be offended by it will not go to the unwise direction of resigning their membership.

The American Legion is a great body. It is a much-needed body, the same as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which is another one of our great veterans' organizations, as well as all of the minor organizations which have as their foundation purposes consistent with the progress of our country in establishing traditions which the future generations will be proud of; but in this particular respect, by stating that the Legion is in favor of the national-origins provision, they have taken a position which, if a referendum were submitted to the members of the Legion, would undoubtedly amaze the Members of Congress as to the vote to the contrary in the Legion.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. May I say to my colleague that I have just received three telegrams from three Legion posts in Lawrence, Peabody, and Lynn, Mass., saying that the sentiments which the representatives of the Legion gave before the committee are not in accord with the sentiment of the membership of those posts?

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for his observation. May I say at this time that Mr. Connery recently displayed the finest act of courage that I have ever seen on the part of any legislator when he voted for the reapportionment bill. I hope that his constituents appreciate his type of representation.

May I add the danger of this, Mr. Chairman, is that we are going back 300 years and making you and me, who are Americans, and consider ourselves Americans, take a position which would destroy the assimilation which all elements and all races have undergone during the past 300 years, and making not only the foreign born of 1920 take a position on this but every one of us, no matter what the origin of our common ancestors who first came to America may have been?

But going back to the American Legion, it has taken a position on quotas. When they take a position favoring the underlying principle of the national-origins clause, they take a position upon the quotas, and when they do that they make a mistake and they exceed the purposes of their organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will.

Mr. SCHAFER. Has the American Legion in convention assembled gone on record in favor of the national-origins scheme for determining the immigration quotas?

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand they have, yes; but it was very peculiarly worded:

"Therefore be it resolved by the American Legion in convention assembled, That we favor and recommend continuance of the method of restriction upon immigration," That is a primary part, and they may have the right to do that. They could go on record in favor of closed or open or restricted immigration. I do not dispute their authority to do that; but then the resolution continues: "that we favor and recommend continuance of the method of restriction upon immigration in the 1924 immigration law with its fundamental national-origins provision, so that American citizenship and economic prosperity may be maintained at the highest possible level."

And in a statement to the Senate Committee on Immigration they said:

"We emphatically uphold the theory underlying the national-origins provision, which is that immigration quotas based upon entire population of the Nation is not only the fairest method for selecting immigrants, but is the most certain method," mark this language, "the most certain method of maintaining in the future the blend of population and the racial mixtures as they exist in America today."

In convention assembled they went on record in favor of that because it was the best means "by which prosperity may be maintained at the present time," the resolution read.

It must be borne distinctly in mind that the quotas cannot be disassociated from the principle itself. The going into effect of the clause automatically established the

quotas, and when the Legion takes a position on the principle they take a position on the quotas established thereunder.

What those quotas will be are a matter of record. Furthermore, the representative said that it was a question between patriotism and slackerism. I also deny such a question is involved. In support of this argument he cited the number of aliens that claimed exemption in the late war. In the first place, the figures do not present the facts correctly. In the second place, the only inferences to draw therefrom is that the nationals of those countries which will receive a reduced quota by the operation of the national origins were the slackers in the late war. This is not only vicious and unwarranted but false. Such an argument is an attack not only on those foreign-born who were here in 1917–18 but upon all generations of Americans of the same blood or descent. Let us see who they are that will suffer by the operation of the national-origins clause and then we can see what elements of our citizenry were insidiously offended and insulted by this argument.

The French, Swiss, Swedish, Norwegians, Danish, Irish, and Germans. All elements representing our best blood, the equal of any other and second to none. In every great crisis their descendants have proven their love for our flag and our institutions of government as set forth in the Constitution. In the Revolutionary War their representation was outstanding, particularly the Irish and the Germans, and the French Government showed its friendship in a way that occupies one of the foremost pages in our history. Are they slackers? Some may think so, but history records otherwise. During the Civil War alone the Irish and the Germans in the service outnumbered the whole army of the South, and each element, as we are compelled to refer to them under this law, had more men in service than any other element of our citizenry. And, yes; after the war was over, and when the men of the South had laid down their arms, and after the death of the great President, which was an unfortunate event for the South at that time, an unthinking North imposed conditions upon the South that were unbearable and inhuman. In the dark days of the carpet-bagging period of the days of reconstruction following the war the only voice raised in Congress for the South were the Representatives in Congress from the city of New York, all of Irish descent, and Charles Francis Adams, of Massachusetts. It was their voices that finally brought about some degree of reason.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. Then the American Legion did not go on record in favor of the national-origins clause?

Mr. MCCORMACK. All I know is what it says in this statement, and from that I draw certain inferences. The gentleman's inferences are as good as mine. I am going to rely on my inference and I do not think the gentleman and I will have any dispute. May I further say to the gentleman that the great agricultural districts of the country have been brought to their present high level by that class of immigrants which the national-origins scheme will discriminate against, and I hope it will be brought to a higher state by the enactment of legislation which will be carrying out the platforms of both parties.

Mr. SCHAFER. I will state that the people of the great State of Wisconsin are absolutely opposed to the national-origins clause, and so are the members of the American Legion in my State. I am not talking about the few officers who may claim to speak for the Legion. The national-origins clause should be repealed. The gentleman is making a fine argument for its repeal.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Some argument has been advanced on the question of certain nationals failing to assimilate. What is the best test of assimilation? To me it is what percentage of immigrants from different countries indicate their permanence and love for America by becoming a citizen. The records of the census of 1920 are interesting in this respect. I will simply read it and allow you to draw your own conclusions:

"The census of 1920 shows that the foreign born from England proper, who were here when that census was taken and who were naturalized, is 64.8; Scotland, 65.6; Wales, 73.5; Ireland, 72.3; Norway, 67.3; Sweden, 69.5; Denmark, 69.6; Netherlands, which has a marked gain, 58.1; Belgium, which has a gain, 55.3; Switzerland, 64.9; France, 60.1; Germany, 73.3; Canada, French, 47.0; Canada, others, 58; and other countries, ranging from 44.7 down to 8.9, every one of the latter of which, under national origins, will gain, with the exception of Rumania."

The argument has also been advanced by certain people that America must maintain a British ascendancy in order that our institutions of Government might be preserved. They say that the operation of the national-origins clause will bring that situation about. Since when has the United States had to depend upon any other country for its existence? The last time that history records that we were a dependency of England was prior to 1776. Yorktown, with its victory, brought about the consummation of our independence. In that conflict for independence, 10,000 men of Irish blood served from Massachusetts alone. Those of German descent, particularly from Pennsylvania, showed their love for the cause of freedom. Likewise, those of Swiss, Swedish, French, Scotch, and other nativities, rendered yeoman service. No one excelled the other. They fought inspired.

We cannot deny, and would not want to deny it, that those of English blood and extraction have contributed in every way in the settling of the Colonies, in the war for independence, and in building up our country and protecting it in time of danger, but we should not discriminate against others who have likewise done their duty.

The operation of the national-origins clause is an affirmative statement by the Congress of the United States that the continuity of our Government is dependent upon England. Such a declaration of subservience should be abhorrent to all who consider themselves Americans.

Mr. Chairman, both parties through their standard bearers in the recent campaign went on record as favoring the repeal of the national-origins clause. Between now and March 4 action will have to be taken in order to prevent its operation. While both parties have responsibilities, the party in the majority will be directly responsible for this iniquitous, discriminatory law unless proper action is taken to repeal or defer its operation. [Applause from both sides of the aisle.]

I have received the following telegrams from American Legion posts:

SOUTH BOSTON, MASS., *February 14, 1929.*
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Post opposed to statement of Legion representatives. Do not know of any slackers in this district of nationals mentioned. District predominantly Irish. Exceeded quota in every instance. * * *

COLUMBIA POST, NO. 51, AMERICAN LEGION,
JAMES F. VAUGHAN, *Commander.*

BOSTON, MASS., *February 11, 1929.*
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Michael J. Perkins Post, American Legion, resents any individual attempting to represent the thought of the American Legion when he says that our neighbors in Europe, whether they be Scandinavian, Jews, English, Greek, Polish, or Irish, are alien slackers. Fortunately our allies and ourselves united as one people. * * *

JOHN J. LYDON, *Commander.*

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill when it came before the House, and I am happy to have the opportunity to vote to sustain the President's veto of the measure at this time.

Inasmuch as we have had no good, constructive legislation on immigration for 27 years, it was hoped that the bill presented to us for action would be reasonable and practicable; that it would cure the basic prejudices and discriminatory ills found in the laws now in effect. This was not our good fortune. It is essentially an exclusionist bill; as the President puts it:

> None of the crying human needs of this time of trouble is recognized in this bill.

It is a bill which ignores elementary standards of fairness in dealing with aliens; in the President's words:

> Seldom has a bill exhibited the distrust evidenced here for citizens and aliens alike, at a time when we need unity at home and the confidence of our friends abroad.

The McCarran-Walter bill, in my opinion, contains more inequities than any immigration bill ever passed by Congress, instead of allowing us to show a more humane attitude toward immigration, it threatens to close our doors tighter than ever. It perpetrates a grave injustice upon the peoples of Southern and Eastern Europe. The National Origins formula adopted in 1929 discriminates against them and the bill before us makes the national-origins legislation even more rigid and exclusive. It will reduce to a minimum the number of those admitted from Italy, Greece, Austria, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

As for nations like Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, now behind the iron curtain, the excuse is made that there is no need for immigration legislation in their favor, but I am concerned about refugees from those countries and that in the displaced-persons legislation their quotas have been frozen for years to come. Our regular immigration legislation prevents even a single Austrian from coming here before 1955; any Latvian before 2074; no Lithuanians can be admitted before 2087, and not one Pole before 1999. The only hope refugees from those countries have in gaining entrance to the United States is by special legislation which would remove immigration restrictions; the McCarran bill continues to freeze all quotas originally included in the Displaced Persons Act.

As the leading nation of the world, we have held ourselves out to be democratic, generous, and in sympathy with the oppressed peoples of other nations who seek shelter within our boundaries. Passage of the Displaced Persons Act and its amendments bore out our kindly

intentions. Enactment of the McCarran-Walter bill, with its glaring inequities and prejudices, will greatly jeopardize our standing among nations, and our international relations are bound to suffer.

This omnibus immigration bill also fails to provide adequate protection to those threatened with deportation; there is not effective provision for hearings held in deportation cases. It makes it far too easy for the Immigration Bureau to deport people; it would pave the way for the Attorney General to deport an alien for any one of a variety of causes, or to denaturalize a person who may have been a United States citizen for years. The persons affected and being proceeded against are entitled to a fair hearing and necessary protection should be given them under the law.

Our country became great because we opened wide the doors to all who wished to come. Peoples from every country have contributed to our growth, culture, and strength. There should be equality for all in the immigration laws we pass—one nation should not be placed above another.

We can afford to continue to be generous. Certainly, our aim should be to eliminate the inequities and prejudices in our present immigration laws—not to enhance them.

Enactment of this bill will damage our standing as a nation; it will saddle us with poor, unfair, discriminatory laws; it will cause untold hardship to countless persons. Indeed, the bill, considering all its provisions, would be a step backward and not a step forward.

We should sustain the President's veto and work for a measure we can be proud of.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice in support of the President's action in vetoing the McCarran-Walter immigration bill. The President acted bravely and humanely. He acted in the best American traditions and in the best interests of the American people.

While the aim of the McCarran-Walter measure was to codify and revise our immigration and naturalization laws, the bill as it was actually presented to us proposes to write into basic legislation the most discriminatory and restrictive immigration policy this country has ever known. The bill also contains major threats to our civil liberties, to the promulgation of our foreign policy, and to our democratic way of life.

For these reasons I voted against this measure when it first came up in the House last April, and I shall vote to sustain the President's veto.

This bill is a dangerous piece of legislation and a threat to the future of our country because the system it prescribes and the methods it proposes are those of the totalitarian and Communist state, or police-state methods. In these crucial days, it is worth while to stop for a moment and reflect upon the direction in which we are heading. Let us remember that even in the worst crisis faced by the American people in the past, they never backed down on their democratic principles and beliefs.

Ours is a government of laws, rather than of men. Our liberties and our way of life must be protected through laws, rather than by dictators.

The McCarran-Walter immigration bill is a step in the direction of dictatorship and police methods. As such, it is contrary to American ideals, principles and traditions. I am happy once again to cast my vote against this bill and I urge all my colleagues to uphold the President's action.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the House will vote to sustain the President's veto. Nothing that I can say here can improve on the very clear and lucid remarks of the President in his veto message. He has once more demonstrated his great statesmanship and his interest in keeping this country great, and in preserving our leadership of the world.

Coming as I do from a district, populated largely by first and second generation Americans, I have been in the forefront of the fight to amend our immigration laws so that they may keep the doors of this great country open to the persecuted and harassed peoples of other countries who seek sanctuary within our borders. The founders of this Nation were in that same category. The continued admission of immigrants has made us the great Nation which we are today. They have brought to our shores many of their skills, in the arts, sciences, and business, and in my opinion, have made us a better nation, more understanding of the problems of the world; and have helped to bring us to the point where we are in a position of world leadership, and in a position to aid those less fortunate throughout the world.

We have proven, I believe, that democracy in its fullest sense means that peope of all religions and racial backgrounds can live together in peace and amity and produce a force which is unbeatable. The bill under consideration which was vetoed, and rightly so, by the President would jeopardize our international relations. It would freeze into law many of the prejudices now contained in our immigration laws and the policies of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice. This legislation has been debated at a period when the world is most sensitive to the thinking of the people of the United States. I had hoped that during the past 5 years the new world position of the United States would induce it to take a more humane and democratic attitude toward immigration. The passing of the Displaced Persons Act in 1948 and of its amendments in 1950 contributed to this belief. Our country has offered a haven to nearly 350,000 displaced persons since the beginning of 1949; but now the bill under consideration which contains more inequities than any immigration bill ever passed by Congress, threatens to close our doors tighter than ever.

The strongest criticism that can be leveled at this bill is its injustice to the peoples of southern and eastern Europe. Let us consider what this measure would mean to the people of Italy. It perpetrates against the Italians all the injustices originally included in the Quota Act of 1924 and the National Origins Formula adopted in 1929, really designed to bar people born in southern and eastern Europe. It is no secret that it was then the intention to keep people from southern and eastern Europe out of the stream of United States life due to the prejudices which existed against people from those areas. With regard to the Italians, for the period from 1900 to 1910, Italian immigration amounted to 2,045,877, or an average of over 200,000 a year. By the act of 1921 it was reduced to 42,000 a year. Under the national origins legislation it was further reduced to 5,800 a year. The Walter bill, I believe, would make it difficult to admit even this number; and what is said about Italy might be said with equal truth about Austria, Greece, Hungary, and Yugoslavia and Poland.

As has been so well said in the other body with regard to the different waves of immigration:

> Differences do not mean inferiority. I believe that at times America is enriched by the fact that there are differences. Think of the contributions which the southern and eastern Europeans have made in the field of art and music.

The Senator whom I am quoting went on to state:

> At each stage in American history the recent comer has been looked down upon by those who were already here * * * The tragedy is that sometimes those who came here and were oppressed when they were new immigrants, once they established themselves, looked down upon the recent immigrant.

All Americans should study the implications of these remarks. All proponents of decent, humane immigration legislation had hoped that new legislation would attempt to eliminate, at least in part, the injustices of the National Origins Act. They had hoped that any new long-term legislation would provide for the pooling of the unused quotas under the National Origins Act, which are largely those of Great Britain and Ireland. The National Origins Act set the British quota at 65,721, but in no year have the British used more than a third of this number. The Irish quota was set at 17,853, but from 10,000 to 12,000 of this quota has not been used each year.

One proposal included in the Lehman-Humphrey bill would pool the unused quotas of from sixty to seventy thousand among the countries with very low quotas. This provision would be of great importance in the Italian situation. The Lehman-Humphrey bill would base the quotas on the 1950 census instead of the census of 1920. Since the population in this period has increased by 40,000,000, this would mean consid-

erably increased quotas for the various countries. That bill would also include Indians and Negroes in computing the population on which quotas are based. This would have the effect of upping the British quota very greatly and increasing the number of immigrants who could be admitted from 153,000 to 263,000.

I had not intended to speak at such length, due to the fact that these matters have been so fully explained heretofore and have been covered in the President's veto message. It is my hope that if we sustain the President's veto we may still get legislation which will accomplish these very humane purposes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mr. THOMAS, the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, who has brought before us today for consideration the conference report on the independent-offices bill.

I want to congratulate him particularly for the stubborn and victorious fight he has led in the conference committee to preserve the will of the House in stopping the abuse of accumulated leave and in securing the agreement of the Senate Members in the conference. He deserves great credit for his fine work.

I also want to give great praise to Congressman TABER, of New York, ranking Republican minority member and to all members of the subcommittee for helping to put an end to the very wasteful practice of accumulated leave. When the report is approved by the House, as it will be, such action will save the Federal Government from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000 annually. At the same time it will protect every legitimate right of the Federal workers. This is a great progressive step on the part of the committee and of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to another progressive step toward economy in government which ties in with this same department of Federal service by pointing out that late in the session in 1951 the Congress passed graduated leave legislation for Federal employees which reduced, in most instances, the amount of leave with pay, and at the same time increased, in a limited way, leave to postal employees so that all would be treated on more equitable basis. The important part of this reduction in leave, which became effective January 6, 1952, is that it is estimated to save the Government a minimum annually of $175,000,000. It is difficult to be exact. However, from the best information I am able to get it would appear that these two pieces of legislation, if the one before us today is ratified by the House and Senate, should add up to a total saving of a minimum of about $320,000,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I have followed this legislation rather closely because I was interested to the extent of introducing a bill, H. R. 2378, on February 5, 1951, which provided for graduated reduction of leave and to stop the abuse of accumulated leave. I am gratified that these abuses I pointed out at that time have finally been taken care of at a great saving to the Government.

On February 5, 1951, speaking in favor of my bill, I said:

> Mr. Speaker, if the President and this Congress really want to make savings in the cost of the Government by reducing nonmilitary expenses, I am introducing a bill that will make it possible to save $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 in the next fiscal year and every year thereafter.
>
> My bill will cut back the present 26-day annual leave for all Federal civilian employees in the executive department of the Government to 15 days' annual leave with pay, on and after June 30, 1951.
>
> Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation also provides that, beginning July 1, 1951, all leave thereafter accruing during the year must be used during the fiscal year in which the same is earned.

Mr. Speaker, the abuse of accumulated leave, if gone into carefully, would really amaze the Members of Congress and would certainly justify the action the Congress is about to take. I have been informed on reliable authority that some employees who start at a low salary allow the leave to accumulate, and as they are promoted to higher salaries as they remain in service, this leave is often drawn not based on the lower salary rates but on the highest rate. This is possibly the worst abuse.

Here is another abuse of accumulated leave. There are about 48,000 high-ranking officials in Government agencies and thousands of military employees who write their own tickets so far as leave is concerned. They do not have to sign a leave slip as the great bulk of low salary employees do. They can travel all over the Nation and be absent from their offices whether on business, recreation, or politics, and they still control their leave. There are instances of high public officials, I understand, who when they have resigned, have drawn several thousand dollars in a lump sum for accumulated leave.

An investigation I have conducted this week reveals that one official drew a lump sum of $3,515.12 termination pay and, I understand, another official who recently resigned received a check of $4,000 as a terminal-leave payment. Even some security risks have been paid off in handsome sums when they left the service. Policy-making officials in addition to controlling their own leave usually determine their travel itinerary which in some instances coincides with sporting events, national conventions, winter investigations in Florida, and so forth.

The Comptroller General has reported to the Congress that the accumulations of annual leave of some postmasters, and these are included among the policy making officials who control their own leave, have reached alarming proportions. He points out one case of a postmaster who had not charged himself with a single day's leave for more than 13 years. It is difficult to believe that in such a case a man had not been away from the office to attend even his "grandmother's funeral." CAF 2 and other low bracket employees, of course, would have to charge to annual leave any failure to report for duty.

Mr. Speaker, I am not against permitting a reasonable amount of annual leave; I think it will make for better employment and service. Those in the lower brackets whose time is certified by a superior have little opportunity to violate the intent of the law. My objection is against those in high brackets who certify or, shall we say, who fail to certify their own leave taking.

If there is any justification for annual leave at all paid by the Government or paid by any employer it is for the employee to refresh himself to come back to the office ready to work harder on his job after a period of relaxation. It is not to create a large stake for terminal leave or retirement purposes. If such policies are desirable, they should be approved on their own merits.

I think it would be a good idea for the proper committee of Congress to keep a watchful eye on this accumulated leave to see that any prevailing abuses are not continued in the future.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 112, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—278

Abbitt	Cooper	Hoffman, Mich.
Adair	Corbett	Holmes
Allen, Calif.	Cotton	Hope
Allen, Ill.	Coudert	Horan
Andersen, H. Carl	Cox	Hull
	Crawford	Hunter
Anderson, Calif.	Crumpacker	Ikard
Andresen, August H.	Cunningham	Jackson, Calif.
	Curtis, Mo.	James
Andrews	Curtis, Nebr.	Jarman
Angell	Dague	Jenison
Arends	Davis, Ga.	Jenkins
Armstrong	Davis, Wis.	Jensen
Auchincloss	Deane	Johnson
Bailey	DeGraffenried	Jonas
Baker	Denny	Jones, Ala.
Barden	Devereux	Jones, Mo.
Baring	D'Ewart	Jones, Hamilton C.
Bates, Mass.	Dolliver	
Battle	Dondero	Jones, Woodrow W.
Beall	Dorn	
Beamer	Doughton	Judd
Belcher	Durham	Kearney
Bender	Elliott	Kearns
Bennett, Fla.	Ellsworth	Kilburn
Bennett, Mich.	Elston	Kilday
Bentsen	Fallon	King, Pa.
Berry	Fernandez	Lanham
Betts	Fisher	Lantaff
Bishop	Ford	Larcade
Blackney	Forrester	Latham
Boggs, Del.	Fugate	LeCompte
Boggs, La.	Gamble	Lind
Bolton	Gary	Lovre
Bonner	Gathings	Lucas
Bosone	Gavin	McConnell
Bow	George	McCulloch
Boykin	Golden	McDonough
Bramblett	Goodwin	McGregor
Bray	Graham	McIntire
Brehm	Granger	McMillan
Brooks	Grant	McMullen
Brown, Ga.	Greenwood	McVey
Brown, Ohio	Gregory	Mack, Wash.
Brownson	Gross	Mansfield
Bryson	Gwinn	Marshall
Budge	Hagen	Martin, Iowa
Buffett	Hale	Martin, Mass.
Burleson	Hall, Leonard W.	Mason
Burnside		Meader
Burton	Halleck	Merrow
Busbey	Harden	Miller, Md.
Bush	Hardy	Miller, Nebr.
Butler	Harris	Miller, N. Y.
Byrnes	Harrison, Nebr.	Mills
Camp	Harrison, Va.	Mumma
Carrigg	Harrison, Wyo.	Murdock
Chatham	Harvey	Murray
Chelf	Hays, Ark.	Nelson
Chenoweth	Hébert	Nicholson
Chiperfield	Hedrick	Norblad
Church	Herlong	Norrell
Clevenger	Hess	O'Hara
Cole, Kans.	Hill	O'Konski
Cole, N. Y.	Hillings	Passman
Colmer	Hinshaw	Patman
Combs	Hoeven	Patten
Cooley	Hoffman, Ill.	Perkins

Phillips	Scrivner	Vail
Poage	Scudder	Van Pelt
Polk	Secrest	Van Zandt
Potter	Shafer	Velde
Poulson	Sheehan	Vorys
Preston	Sheppard	Vursell
Priest	Short	Walter
Prouty	Sikes	Watts
Rains	Simpson, Ill.	Weichel
Reams	Simpson, Pa.	Werdel
Redden	Sittler	Wharton
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Kans.	Wheeler
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Miss.	Whitten
Rees, Kans.	Smith, Va.	Widnall
Regan	Smith, Wis.	Wigglesworth
Riehlman	Springer	Williams, Miss.
Riley	Stanley	Williams, N. Y.
Rivers	Stockman	Willis
Roberts.	Taber	Wilson, Ind.
Robeson	Talle	Wilson, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.	Teague	Winstead
Rogers, Mass.	Thomas	Withrow
Rogers, Tex.	Thompson,	Wolcott
St. George	Mich.	Wolverton
Saylor	Thornberry	Wood, Ga.
Schenck	Tollefson	Wood, Idaho
Scott, Hardie	Trimble	

NAYS—112

Anfuso	Hart	Morgan
Ayres	Havenner	Morrison
Bakewell	Hays, Ohio	Moulder
Barrett	Heffernan	Multer
Blatnik	Heller	Murphy
Bolling	Herter	O'Brien, Ill.
Buchanan	Heselton	O'Brien, Mich.
Buckley	Holifield	O'Brien, N. Y.
Canfield	Howell	O'Neill
Cannon	Irving	Osmers
Case	Jackson, Wash.	Ostertag
Celler	Javits	O'Toole
Chudoff	Karsten, Mo.	Patterson
Clemente	Kean	Philbin
Crosser	Keating	Price
Dawson	Kelley, Pa.	Rabaut
Delaney	Kelly, N. Y.	Radwan
Denton	Kennedy	Rhodes
Dingell	Keogh	Ribicoff
Dollinger	Kerr	Rodino
Donohue	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Colo.
Donovan	King, Calif.	Rooney
Doyle	Kirwan	Roosevelt
Eberharter	Klein	Ross
Engle	Kluczynski	Sadlak
Feighan	Lane	Scott,
Fine	Lesinski	Hugh D., Jr.
Flood	McCarthy	Seely-Brown
Fogarty	McCormack	Shelley
Forand	McGrath	Sieminski
Fulton	McGuire	Spence
Furcolo	McKinnon	Staggers
Garmatz	Machrowicz	Taylor
Gordon	Mack, Ill.	Wier
Granahan	Madden	Yates
Green	Magee	Yorty
Hall,	Miller, Calif.	Zablocki
Edwin Arthur	Mitchell	
Hand	Morano	

NOT VOTING—40

Aandahl	Evins	Richards
Abernethy	Fenton	Sabath
Addonizio	Frazier	Sasscer
Albert	Gore	Steed
Allen, La.	Kee	Stigler
Aspinall	Lyle	Sutton
Bates, Ky.	Mahon	Tackett
Beckworth	Morris	Thompson, Tex.
Burdick	Morton	Vinson
Carlyle	Pickett	Welch
Carnahan	Powell	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Ramsay	Woodruff
Dempsey	Rankin	
Eaton	Reece, Tenn.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fenton and Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Abernethy and Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Addonizio against.

Mr. Eaton and Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may insert their remarks in the RECORD on the veto message, prior to the roll call.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it happens that my first speech in Congress in February 1929 was against the national origins clause. I ask unanimous consent in connection with my remarks that I may include the speech I made in the House in February 1929.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FIRST WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2421) to amend the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257) amending and extending title II of the First War Powers Act 1941 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say firstly that this bill has the unanimous vote of the Committee on the Judiciary. It seeks to extend title II of the First War Powers Act for 1 year. Those powers expire on Monday next, and in a word they empower the Department of Defense to make certain fair and equitable amendments and changes in procurement contracts. For example, in some instances there is permitted extension of delivery dates in appropriate cases and the making of advance payments or partial payments where such payments would not otherwise be authorized. It has permitted the emergency sale of spare parts to civil airlines when necessary to keep airlines operating.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand it is chiefly a matter concerning the Department of Defense, and it is a unanimous report on the part of the committee?

Mr. CELLER. Substantially the Department of Defense—not completely but substantially the Department of Defense. There is a safeguarding provision, namely: the Comptroller General must pass upon all these changes.

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

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257), is hereby amended by striking out "1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "1953".

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.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1953—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2315)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7072) "making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 40, 42, 98, 103, 105, 123, 131 and 132.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 28, 67, 76, 77, 79, 82, 87, 119, 124, 127, and 129, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$59,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,461,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,475"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,590"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,509,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$479,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$321,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,408,460"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$88,525"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$202,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,085,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$142,235"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,053,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,062,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"Executive direction and staff operations: For necessary expenses in the performance of executive direction and staff operations for activities under the control of the General Services Administration; including not to exceed $97,385 for expenses of travel; not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals; and processing and determining net renegotiation rebates; $4,140,750.

"Public Buildings Service: For necessary expenses of real property management and related activities as provided by law; including the salary of the Commissioner of Public Buildings at the rate of $16,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; repair and improvement of public buildings and grounds (including furnishings and equipment) under the control of the General Services Administration; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; demolition of buildings; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and not to exceed $177,335 for expenses of travel; $101,046,030: *Provided*, That the foregoing appropriation shall not be available to effect the moving of Government agencies from the District of Columbia into buildings acquired to accomplish the dispersal of departmental functions of the executive establishment into areas outside of but accessible to the District of Columbia.

"Federal Supply Service: For necessary expenses of personal property management and related activities as provided by law; including not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $77,600 for expenses of travel; and the purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; $2,154,100.

"National Archives and Records Service: For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law; including preparation of guides and other finding aids to records of the Second World War; purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; and not to exceed $23,340 for expenses of travel; $4,868,200."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$74,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$133,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,536,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$160,425"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$237,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,606,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", but such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed $455,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$112,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in excess of thirty-five thousand dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this Act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of thirty-five thousand to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1953, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$91,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,275; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$230,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,319,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$163,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$974,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$112,620"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$709,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$240,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$48,586,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$24,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$118,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$235,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,407,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$101,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "not to exceed $78,125 for expenses of travel, National Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Management; not to exceed $408,925 for expenses of travel, State Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Servicing; $92,500 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board, of which not to exceed $3,875 shall be available for expenses of travel; and $215,200 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Doctors, Dentists, and Allied Specialists, of which not to exceed $45,000 shall be available for expenses of travel;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,225"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,419,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,240,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,291,375"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,546,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,530,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$843,382,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$734,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the date named in said amendment insert "July 1, 1952"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,617,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$145,525"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,655,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

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

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,921,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendmend of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,041,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,238,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,252,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "and $320,200 for allowances for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets at State marine schools, to be paid in accordance with regulations established pursuant to law (46 U. S. C. 1126 (b)); $663,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,509,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$138,105"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ":*Provided further*, That administrative expenses not under limitation for the purposes set forth in the budget schedules for the fiscal year 1953 shall not exceed $151,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House reced from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for the examination of Federal and State chartered institutions shall not exceed $1,775,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$146,125"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That expenditures for nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed $28,870,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,534,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$697,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by or pursuant to law shall not exceed $32,722,080"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 118: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "not to exceed $142,500 of"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,755"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number named in said amendment, insert "one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended by adding at the end thereof and before the period the following: ": *Provided further*, That this section shall not be applicable to annual leave accumulated prior to January 1, 1952"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "403"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "404"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19, 37, 48, 68, 86 and 130.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
LISTER HILL,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Emergency fund for the President

Amendment No. 1—National Defense: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of the Budget

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $3,461,200, instead of $3,314,400 as proposed by the House and $3,608,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide $59,250 for expenses of travel, instead of $54,000 as proposed by the House and $64,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Counsel of Economic Advisers

Amendments Nos. 4, 5, and 6—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $225,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of $208,900 as proposed by the House; provide that the appropriation shall remain available until March 31, 1953, as proposed by the Senate; and limit funds available for expenses of travel to $2,475, instead of $2,200 as proposed by the House and $2,750 as proposed by the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

American Battle Monuments Commission

Amendment No. 7—Expenses of travel: Authorizes the use of $11,590 for this purpose, instead of $10,300 as proposed by the House and $12,865 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 10 and 11—Construction of memorials and cemeteries: Reported in disagreement.

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendments Nos. 12, 13 and 14—Operating expenses: Strike out the provision of the

House authorizing the purchase of automobiles, as proposed by the Senate, authorize the use of $2,509,350 for expenses of travel, instead of $2,230,500 as proposed by the House and $2,788,200 as proposed by the Senate; and consolidate funds for program direction and administration personnel into one fund as proposed by the Senate instead of providing separate limitations for the District of Columbia and the field as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16 and 18—Plant and equipment: Authorize the purchase of plant and equipment, as proposed by the Senate; and the purchase of aircraft, including the purchase of not to exceed two hundred and twenty-five passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate; and except from audit contracts with a foreign government, and contracts for source material with foreign producers, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 19—Plant and equipment: Reported in disagreement.

Civil Service Commission

Amendment No. 20—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of $479,250 for expenses of travel, instead of $426,000 as proposed by the House and $532,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21—Payment to civil-service retirement and disability fund: Appropriates $321,450,000 for payment to the fund, instead of $321,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $321,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Communications Commission

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $6,408,460, instead of $6,108,460 as proposed by the House and $6,708,460 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $88,525 for expenses of travel, instead of $78,700 as proposed by the House and $98,350 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are advised that the Federal Communications Commission, under the provisions of Title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, are authorized to levy fair and equitable fees in connection with the issuing of licenses. The conferees, therefore, request the commission to give prompt attention to the matter with a view to levying such fees at the earliest practicable date.

Federal Power Commission

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,085,700, instead of $3,935,700 as proposed by the House and $4,235,700 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $202,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $180,000 as proposed by the House and $225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,053,800, instead of $3,978,800 as proposed by the House and $4,128,800 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $142,235 for expenses of travel, instead of $126,470 as proposed by the House and $158,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Accounting Office

Amendment No. 28—Salaries: Appropriates $30,100,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $28,600,000 as proposed by the House. The conference committee is in agreement that foreign offices should be established at strategic points abroad. It is the understanding of the conferees that a sum sufficient to enable the General Accounting Office to initiate this program in the fiscal year 1953 shall be used for this purpose.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriate $1,960,000, instead of $1,835,000 as proposed by the House and $2,085,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $1,062,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 31—Operating expenses: The conferees have approved the House version of appropriation structure for this activity, which consists of separate appropriations and appropriation paragraphs for executive direction and staff operations; Public Buildings Service; Federal Supply Service; and National Archives and Records Service; in lieu of a lump-sum appropriation under the heading "Operating expenses" as proposed by the Senate. The action of the conferees provide a total increase of $3,000,000 in excess of the total provided by the House for these four items, and this sum has been distributed proportionately. Adjustments also have been made to provide funds for expenses of travel somewhat in excess of the limitations proposed in the House bill. In accepting the appropriation structure as contained in the House bill the conferees recognize that a few additional auditors may be required to keep accounts under the four separate appropriations, and due consideration will be given to any request for such personnel (not in excess of ten) which may be submitted at a later date.

Amendment No. 32—Emergency expenses: Authorizes the use of $24,300 for expenses of travel, instead of $21,600 as proposed by the House and $27,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 33 and 34—Renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia: Appropriate $4,750,000, instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $37,550 for expenses of travel, instead of $33,400 as proposed by the House and $41,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 35 and 36—Repair, preservation, and equipment, outside the District of Columbia: Appropriate $9,250,000, instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $74,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $66,000 as proposed by the House and $83,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, and 40—Expenses, general supply fund: Appropriate $14,536,500, instead of $13,998,000 as proposed by the House and $15,075,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $133,900 for expenses of travel, instead of $119,000 as proposed by the House and $148,800 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the purchase of five passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House instead of twelve as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments 41 and 42—Strategic and critical materials: Authorize the use of $160,425 for expenses of travel, instead of $142,600 as proposed by the House and $178,250 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House. No funds have been allowed for the construction of storage facilities and it is the decision of the conferees that such facilities shall be secured through the rental of such space. In the event an emergency should arise in this connection which may demand construction of facilities, approval of the chairmen of the Senate and House Committee on Appropriations shall be secured for the expenditure of funds for such purpose.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Office of the Administrator

Amendments Nos. 43, 44, and 45—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,606,000, instead of $3,606,000 as proposed by the House and $5,606,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $237,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $210,000 as proposed by the House and $265,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation on nonadministrative expenses proposed by the House, amended and increased from $374,000 to $455,000.

Amendments No. 46—Defense Community Facilities and Services: Inserts the provision of the Senate amended to provide $112,500 for such purpose instead of $225,000.

Public Housing Administration

Amendment No. 47—Annual contributions: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate and restores the proposal of the House amended to limit during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of not to exceed 35,000 dwelling units.

Amendment No. 48—Annual contributions—occupancy of housing units by subversives: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 49—Administrative expenses: Appropriates $8,000,000, instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Indian Claims Commission

Amendments Nos. 50 and 51—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $91,400, instead of $89,300 as proposed by the House and $93,500 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $2,275 for expenses of travel, instead of $2,000 as proposed by the House and $2,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendments Nos. 52 and 53—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $9,319,500, instead of $8,935,000 as proposed by the House and $9,704,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $230,650 for expenses of travel, instead of $205,000 as proposed by the House and $256,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55—Railroad safety: Appropriate $974,500, instead of $907,000 as proposed by the House and $1,042,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $163,050 for expenses of travel, instead of $145,000 as proposed by the House and $181,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 56 and 57—Locomotive inspection: Appropriate $709,500, instead of $664,000 as proposed by the House and $755,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $112,620 for expenses of travel, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $125,240 as proposed by the Senate.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

Amendments Nos. 58 and 59—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $48,586,100 for this purpose, instead of $46,522,200 as proposed by the House and $50,650,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $240,050 for expenses of travel, instead of $213,400 as proposed by the House and $266,700 as proposed by the Senate.

National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Amendment No. 60—Land acquisition: Authorizes the use of $24,940 for necessary expenses in connection with land acquisition, instead of $22,375 as proposed by the House and $27,500 as proposed by the Senate.

National Science Foundation

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,750,000, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House and $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $118,750 for expenses of travel, instead of $95,000 as proposed by the House and $142,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Renegotiation Board

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $5,407,800, instead of $4,907,800 as proposed by the House and $5,907,800 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $235,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $180,000 as proposed by the House and $291,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 69—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of $101,250 for expenses of travel, instead of $90,000 as proposed by the House and $112,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Selective Service System

Amendments Nos. 66 and 67—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $36,772,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $36,597,000 as proposed by the House; and restores the language of the House placing limitations on the several activities of this agency including limitations on funds available for the use of travel adjusted to provide a compromise figure in each instance on the funds which may be used for travel expense.

Amendment No. 68: Reported in disagreement.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendments Nos. 69 and 70—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $2,419,500, instead of $2,274,000 as proposed by the House and $2,565,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize use of $10,225 for expenses of travel, instead of $9,100 as proposed by the House and $11,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 71 and 72—Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: Appropriate $1,240,550, instead of $1,181,100 as proposed by the House and $1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $1,800 for expenses of travel, instead of $1,600 as proposed by the House and $2,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Subversive Activities Control Board

Amendment No. 73—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of $5,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $4,000 as proposed by the House and $7,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Tariff Commission

Amendments Nos. 74 and 75—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $1,291,375, instead of $1,194,750 as proposed by the House and $1,388,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $13,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $12,000 as proposed by the House and $15,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Amendments Nos. 76, 77, 78 and 79: Appropriate $186,027,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $171,270,000 as proposed by the House; authorize the purchase of 220 automobiles of which 150 shall be for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, instead of 110 for replacement only as proposed by the House; authorize the use of $1,546,650 for expenses of travel, instead of $1,375,000 as proposed by the House and $1,718,300 as proposed by the Senate; and strike out the provisions of the House requiring a performance bond or satisfactory warranty in connection with the purchase of coal, and placing a limitation on funds available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans' Administration

Amendments Nos. 80 and 81—Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: Appropriate $843,382,260, instead of $809,382,260 as proposed by the House and $877,382,260 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $3,530,700 for expenses of travel, instead of $3,138,400 as proposed by the House and $3,923,000 as proposed by the Senate. Conferees have approved the full amount of the Budget estimate for research including work in connection with prosthetic appliances and have further agreed that there should be no reduction in the number of doctors, dentists, nurses, and dietitians.

Amendment No. 82—Hospital and domiciliary facilities: Appropriates $66,316,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $153,600,000 as proposed by the House. It is the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee on conference that the hospital needs of neuropsychiatric veterans, and those veterans afflicted with tuberculosis, should have immediate consideration, and that a careful review of the funds to be available during the next fiscal year should be made with a view to diverting all such funds as may be available for use in the provision of NP and TB beds in the western area of the United States where there is an urgent and growing need for such facilities.

Amendment No. 83—Major alterations, improvements, and repairs: Appropriates $8,750,000, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

War Claims Commission

Amendments Nos. 84 and 85—Administrative expenses: Appropriate $734,550, instead of $683,000 as proposed by the House and $786,100 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $9,000 for expenses of travel, instead of $8,000 as proposed by the House and $10,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 86—Reduction in appropriation, National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission: Reported in disagreement.

Independent offices—general provisions

Amendment No. 87—Persons engaged in personnel work: Exempts from the provisions of the section persons engaged on work as committees of expert examiners and boards of civil service examiners as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Maritime Activities

Amendment No. 88—Operating-differential subsidies: Inserts the language of the Senate amendment in lieu of the proposal of the House in connection with the number of voyages for subsidized operators amended to be effective as to new operators on July 1, 1952, instead of July 1, 1951, as proposed in the Senate amendment.

Amendments Nos. 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95 and 96—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate a total of $15,617,850 for such purpose, instead of $14,375,700 as proposed by the House and $16,860,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide $8,655,850 for administrative expenses, instead of $8,099,700 as proposed by the House and $9,212,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which $145,525 shall be available for expenses of travel, instead of $130,700 as proposed by the House and $160,350 as proposed by the Senate, authorize the transfer of funds from the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund for the employment of four hundred employees, instead of three hundred as proposed by the House and five hundred as proposed by the Senate; provide $1,921,000 for maintenance of shipyard facilities, operation of warehouses, etc., instead of $1,764,000 as proposed by the House and $2,078,000 as proposed by the Senate; of which $2,490 shall be available for expenses of travel, instead of $2,200 as proposed by the House and $2,775 as proposed by the Senate; and provide $5,041,000 for reserve fleet expenses, instead of $4,512,000 as proposed by the House and $5,570,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which $7,490 shall be available for expenses of travel, instead of $6,650 as proposed by the House and $8,325 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102 and 103—Maritime training: Appropriate $3,252,100, instead of $2,795,200 as proposed by the House and $3,990,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $2,238,900 for personal services, instead of $1,881,600 as proposed by the House and $2,474,100 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminate the provision of the Senate excluding from the foregoing amount for personal services the pay of cadet midshipmen; authorize the use of $2,000 for contingencies for the superintendent, instead of $1,500 as proposed by the House and $2,500 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $25,625 for expenses of travel, instead of $20,500 as proposed by the House and $30,750 as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the transfer of $65,540 to the Public Health Service, instead of $55,680 as proposed by the House and $72,500 as proposed by the Senate; and eliminate the proposal of the Senate providing for pay of cadet midshipmen, restoring in lieu thereof the House provision for uniforms and textbooks.

Amendment No. 104—State marine schools: Appropriates $663,200, instead of $643,400 as proposed by the House and $1,092,050 as proposed by the Senate; and eliminates the proposal of the Senate providing for the pay of cadet midshipmen at $65 per month and $275 per annum for subsistence, restoring the provision of the House bill providing for allowances for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence, amended to provide $320,200, instead of $300,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 105: Restores the provision of the House relating to payment for vessels requisitioned or insured by the Government and lost while so requisitioned or insured.

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendments Nos 106, 107, and 108—Federal National Mortgage Association: Authorize the use of $3,509,500 of available funds for administrative expenses, instead of $3,371,425 as proposed by the House and $3,647,600 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $6,750 for expenses of travel, instead of $122,760 as proposed by the House and $153,450 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation of the House on administrative expenses not under limitation, amended to fix such limitation at $151,000.

Amendment No. 109—Office of the Administrator (prefabricated housing): Authorizes the use of $6,750 for expenses and travel, instead of $6,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 110 and 111—Home Loan Bank Board: Authorize the use of $22,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation of the House on nonadministrative expenses for examination of Federal and State chartered institutions, amended to fix such limitation at $1,775,000.

Amendment No. 112—Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: Authorizes the use of $4,150 for expenses of travel, instead of $3,700 as proposed by the House and $4,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 113 and 114—Federal Housing Administration: Authorize the use of $140,125 for expenses of travel, instead of $130,000 as proposed by the House and $162,250 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation of the House on nonadministrative expenses, amended to fix such limitation at $28,870,000.

Amendments Nos. 115, 116, 117, and 118—Public Housing Administration: Authorize the use of $11,534,000 of available funds for administrative expenses, instead of $10,455,000, as proposed by the House and $12,613,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $697,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $620,000 as proposed by the House and $775,000 as proposed by the Senate; restore the limitation of the House on nonadministrative expenses, amended to fix such limitation at $32,722,080; and authorize the use of $142,500 of available funds for expenses in connection with the sale of certain properties, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House.

Inland Waterways Corporation

Amendments Nos. 119, 120, and 121—Administrative expenses: Authorize the use of $481,200 of available funds for administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $467,330 as proposed by the House; authorize the use of $10,755 for expenses of travel, instead of $9,560 as proposed by the

House and $11,950 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the purchase of one and hire of passenger motor vehicles, instead of the purchase of two such vehicles as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 122—Limitation on annual leave, civilian officers and employees: Restores the matter stricken out by said amendment, adding thereto a provision to the effect that the section shall not be applicable to annual leave accumulated prior to January 1, 1952.

Amendment No. 123: Corrects a section number.

Amendment No. 124: Limitation on number of automobiles operated at seat of government: Strikes out the proposal of the House in this connection.

Amendments Nos. 125 and 126: Correct section numbers.

Amendment No. 127: Restriction on compensation of persons acting as chauffeurs: Inserts the proposal of the Senate to except persons on duty in a foreign country.

Amendment No. 128: Prohibition against appointment of personnel and percentage reduction in funds available for personal services: Omits the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment.

Amendment No. 129: Fixes a ceiling of $1,600 which may be paid for the acquisition of passenger motor vehicles, with certain exceptions, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 130: Limitation on funds available for personnel engaged in information, publicity, editorial, and similar work: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 131: Limitation on funds available for pay above basic rates and for transportation of things: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate.

Amendment No. 132: Corrects a section number.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I understand there will be a motion to recommit by our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. In order to be perfectly fair in the matter, I understand I have 1 hour, and I want to yield one-half of that to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. We will have only two or three speakers on this side and I would like to close debate so if the gentleman will use his 30 minutes it will be fine.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman, and, in accepting the terms of that offer, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, and the question before us, grouped as one problem, is a very simple problem.

The conference report on independent offices, when we went to conference with the Senate, had 132 points at issue. Several of those were technical points. The important point is that out of the entire lot, the committee of conference was in agreement upon all those which I can now group.

In order to save time, the minority managers on the part of the House, did not sign the report and I shall explain our reasons for that. I shall also say that in order to save time we will not attempt, as the items are read by number in the conference report, to amend or change or to return any of those at that time. At the proper time I shall offer a motion to recommit, and in order that this matter may be clear in the discussion I shall read the motion to recommit:

I move to recommit the bill H. R. 7072 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House provisions on the number of housing units to be commenced in fiscal 1953—

Which is item 47—

to insist on the inclusion of the money necessary for new hospital construction.

This is for veterans' hospitals and appears as item 82—

to insist on the orderly formula for personnel replacement contained in the so-called Jensen amendment.

That is item 128, which I shall further explain—

and further to insist on the Senate provisions for the appropriations for maritime training.

Items 97 to 103, inclusive.

There was one other item because of which the minority members did not sign the report, and that had to do with the number of steam plants for the Tennessee Valley Authority. But since it is a small matter, whether we discuss it in this conference report or whether we discuss it tomorrow when the supplemental bill comes up, the minority members with whom this was discussed decided not to include that in the motion to recommit.

Why do we bring this back? Because when this subcommittee came to you with the independent offices bill we said to you that these were our best opinions, and in several of those cases, by recorded vote upon the floor, you changed our decisions. We felt that we did not have the right to accept in conference the changes which were made in the Senate and concurred in by a majority of the conferees without bringing it back to the floor for action.

On the floor on March 20 we proposed 25,000 houses. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] offered an amendment limiting that to 5,000 houses. This was carried by a recorded vote. The Senate changed this to 45,000 houses, and by a vote of approximately 2 to 1 in the conference 35,000 houses would be permitted to be started in fiscal year 1953.

There are many people upon this floor who believe that that is a larger number of houses than should be permitted to be started in the fiscal year 1953, and you will have an opportunity to express your opinion whether you agree with the people who think that way.

On the matter of the Jensen amendment I want you to understand thoroughly what the situation is, because I, for one, think it is very important. Actually, in many of the individual agencies for which we are providing money we, between the House and Senate, have cut the amount to an amount equal to or less than the amount which would have been provided in the Jensen amendment. The question therefore arises, why do I ask you to vote on the Jensen amendment to authorize us to insist upon the orderly formula for personnel replacement? Because if we do not insist upon this and send us back to conference the head of an agency, included in this bill, will have the right to remove people to meet the reductions in money and, therefore, in personnel, at his judgment.

The Jensen amendment provided a formula by which people who left the agency for any reason, voluntarily or otherwise, would not be replaced until these figures were reached; and I, for one, think that is an important amendment and that we should insist upon it.

I do not believe that this House knowingly would permit the figure to stand for the Veterans' Administration hospitals. The Senate cut out all construction for the new hospitals for veterans, leaving us in this situation—and please, Mr. Speaker, I do not stand here to defend the number of hospitals that have been built, the number of beds in the hospitals that have been built, or the location of the hospitals that have been built. For 10 years I have been endeavoring to induce the Veterans' Administration to make a re-evaluation of the veterans' hospital program. We have built these hospitals, whether or not they were correct; we have built them of a size which may or may not have been correct, and now when we reach the greatest need of all, the need for neuropsychiatric hospitals, with one stroke the other body cuts out the money for the neuropsychiatric hospitals, the NP hospitals.

In the program there were four hospitals, one to be built in the Middle West—that was not in this money and that will come next year—one to be built in the Middle West, Cleveland, of a thousand beds; and two to be built on the west coast of a thousand beds each. We have leveled ground for one of them and have asked for bids. We have acquired the land for the other. We would have to stop the bids and pay a penalty.

We may have put hospitals in the wrong place, we may have built too many general medical and surgical hospitals, but we cannot today deny the hospitals most needed for the veterans where the veterans are today and not where they used to be 10 years ago.

And so, in conclusion, because I do not wish to delay the House, it seems to me that the House should send us back to conference on the four items I have indicated in this particular motion to recommit.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The four hospitals that have been cut out by the Senate, is that in addition to the 16,000 beds the President took away from the VA some years ago?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct as I understand it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand the conferees have approved the full amount of the budget estimate for research, including work in connection with prosthetic appliances. There is to be no reduction in the number of nurses, dieticians, and so forth?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself two additional minutes.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I am sure that the gentleman from California will agree with me when I interpolate this observation. I think those of us representing the minority side of the subcommittee have always admired greatly our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. I, for one, never admired him so much as in the course of the conference on this bill. He did a truly magnificent job and he came back with a magnificent victory on almost all of the 130 items. He saved the important language in the housing clause, he saved the important Thomas rider, he saved a great deal of the matters that are very important in this bill. I am sure the gentleman from California will agree that it is only because of the solemn vote taken in this House on the housing question and on the matter of veterans' hospitals as well as the Jensen amendment that compels us to come back to make sure that the House passes on those vital questions; is that correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman makes my peroration for me. That is exactly the situation. We greatly admire the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and, furthermore, we bring this bill back with an unusual condition in it—with less money than when it left the House. I think this marks a milestone in the relations between the two bodies.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will the gentleman explain to us why we have to consider all four of these together?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Because all four are in the minds of some people. You may not be interested in all four, other people are not interested in the ones you are interested in.

I neglected to say anything about the maritime appropriation. I will not go into it at length, but it has to do with the maritime training schools which is an obligation of the Federal Government and which I feel is important.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. Is there any possibility under the present procedure to have the four items divided as separate amendments so that there could be separate votes on each one?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; I am making them as one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to explain some points of the Jensen amendment. I want every Member of this body to know that there is nothing in the Jensen amendment any place which keeps a department from reducing its personnel to a greater degree than what is provided for in the Jensen amendment. Also on items which the committee and the conferees have reduced to a greater degree than is provided in the Jensen amendment the figures in the bill still hold good. In other words, the Jensen amendment does not apply to any item that the committee has cut to a greater degree than the Jensen amendment provides. The original Jensen amendment that passed this House would cut the bill passed by the House approximately $50,000,000. It applied to the number of personnel who were on the rolls in each one of these agencies as of July 1, 1952. Hence, any claim that might be made that the committee cuts are greater than are provided for in the Jensen amendment, is simply not a fact.

The minority members of the committee have suggested a compromise which was printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A3868. This proposed compromise will not save as much money as the original amendment, because it applies to the budget instead of applying to the number on the rolls as of July 1, 1952. So much for that.

Now regarding the four veterans hospitals which the Senate saw fit to cut out of the House bill. It can be said truthfully and honestly that we Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, who have been constantly fighting to cut out waste and extravagance for nonessential expenditures for Government have not and will not economize for the facilities needed for proper care of disabled veterans, and hence we hope the fund for these hospitals will be restored. I shall support the motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the public-housing amendment that was accepted by the conference committee. The acceptance of 35,000 units was a matter of compromise. I would have preferred to have seen the entire 45,000 units voted by the Senate accepted by the House conferees, and I would have preferred to see the language of the Fisher amendment stricken from the conference report. The Senate considered this bill, and it struck the entire Fisher amendment including the very harsh language which prevents advance planning by the Public Housing Authority. The conferees reinserted it. I would like to remind the gentleman from California who now seeks to recommit this report to conference, that when he was arguing for the antiadvance planning language, the so-called antileapfrog provision last year, he stated that this provision was even more important than the limitation upon public-housing starts. He said at that time it would prevent the Public Housing Administration from making plans for thousands and thousands of units for years into the future. Personally, I believe advance planning is necessary, but in the interest of achieving a compromise I was willing to abide by the decision of the conferees to accept 35,000 units and to include this language. Let me point out that under this language, the number of units that may be constructed in any single year is entirely within the control of the Congress.

The only matter in controversy, therefore, is the number of public-housing units that shall be constructed this year. The conference approved 35,000 units. Is this an inordinate number? Does this number even approach the number contemplated in the Public Housing Act of 1949 which this House adopted? Of course not. That act provided for the construction of 135,000 units each year. This number is 100,000 less. It is less than half the number approved this year by the Bureau of the Budget.

Moreover, in the Housing act of 1949, it was contemplated that the number of public-housing units would be constructed at a rate of 10 percent of the total number of housing starts. The number we are asking the House to approve today does not even approximate that ratio. In the year 1949, for example, we had over a million private housing starts. In 1950, there were more than 1,400,000 private housing starts. In 1951, despite defense cutbacks, there were over 1,100,000 private housing starts, and this year bids fair to pass even the mark set during 1951. In addition, it must be remembered that the Government has provided tremendous advantages to the private building industry which must be considered in the total picture as well. The Federal Government has provided reserves and investment insurance in savings and loan institutions with resources totaling $17,500,000,000 serving 12,000,000 individual borrowers and investors. Through the Federal Housing Administration there have been more than 15,000,000 housing loans totaling more than $25,000,000,000, enabling more families to own their own homes and builders and renters to greatly extend their business. The Government has guaranteed 2,500,000 home loans to veterans, totaling more than $15,000,000,000 and has provided over $2,750,000,000 for Government mortgage purchases. This has given tremendous impetus toward the construction of private homes, and the sum total of all the investment by the Government toward stimulating the construction of private housing is in excess of $70,000,000,000.

Much has been said about the fact that this is socialized housing. The effort is made by using this term to conjure up a horrible implication toward public housing. It was not so very long ago that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in a speech in the other body appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 4, pages 4600–4601, stated the following:

> The question we have to meet, in addition to private housing, arises from the tremendous number of slum dwellings, of indecent dwellings, in many cities in the United States, and to some extent in the rural districts, which have gradually developed. We have a system of private enterprise which has built millions of

houses for us over the years, and yet, regardless of the fact that that system has been free, the houses at the bottom have steadily deteriorated, and there are approximately five or six million homes the rentals of which are about $15, because the homes have deteriorated. Many of them are gradually being replaced, and will be replaced through private enterprise. But I, myself, became convinced that there was nothing to show that private building in the future, any more than private building in the past, would ever eliminate the slums; and the result of simply tearing them down is to develop slums in other areas exactly as the previous slums were developed.

The difficulty arises from the fact that housing is still more expensive than it ought to be for the income of the people. Today the fact still is that the people's income is such that families that are perfectly able to pay for their food and their clothing and their other activities are unable to pay a rent sufficient to obtain a decent house.

He also stated:

If we can reduce the cost of housing I should say we might eliminate the problem of public housing, but otherwise there is a very considerable group of persons who are unable to pay for decent houses, but who are able to pay for everything else.

The question is, What can the Government do about it? It cannot be said that the Government has no interest in the problem. The Government has gone into it through FHA and through private housing. The Government has an interest in seeing that the lower-income groups have decent homes. It has long been recognized in this country and in England and elsewhere that there is an obligation of government to see that every family shall have a minimum amount of food in the form of relief. We have long recognized the principle that persons who cannot pay for medical care should be given a minimum of medical care. We have recognized the principle that persons who cannot pay for education should be given a free education. We have gone further in education than we have in the other fields. We have not, until within the past 10 years, recognized a similar obligation with regard to shelter. I very strongly believe we have that obligation. I believe that if we desire to have reasonable equality of opportunity for the children of this country they must be allowed to grow up in a situation in which there is at least decent shelter in which families can live as human beings and can receive a start in life free from crime and free from the demoralization of character resulting from living in a slum area.

Today housing is a more difficult problem than is relief or medical care. We have tried different methods. Can it be solved through the giving of relief? Can we solve the problem simply by paying tenants a sufficient amount to enable them to pay their rent, if they receive a very low income or no income at all? The general answer is that that will not solve the problem. There are still slum areas, and in all probability we shall not improve them. The persons who own them will simply receive larger rents. They may put the housing in better condition, but no one will build a new home on the chance that 10 years from today someone may not be receiving relief. We do not know whether it will work.

What about the question of private industry doing this job? To use the words of the same gentleman as they appear later in the speech:

There has been much criticism of the bill by real estate boards and private contractors. As the bill is written, there is not the slightest competition with private industry. We provide in the bill that no one shall be allowed to occupy a house in one of these areas if he is paying within 20 percent of the rental which must be paid for housing of a reasonably decent character in the particular community. As we have limited the terms of the bill, no private industry is justified in making the claim that there is any competition with industry in the type of public housing proposed in title VI. So far as I can judge, no way can be discovered to eliminate slums, unless while we are reducing the cost we are helping private industry.

Further in his speech the Senator stated:

A complete housing program cannot be carried on unless we are prepared to provide some public housing at the bottom of the scale, and set an example, help eliminate slums, and take the edge off the problem at the bottom.

I doubt that any of the gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle who are opposing this conference report and the construction of public-housing units, and I doubt that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], who would cut the number of housing units to 5,000, can successfully claim that the gentleman from Ohio is a Socialist or is in any way the champion of socialism.

Mr. Speaker, this report is a compromise. In conferences we cannot get everything we want, although I think that under the very able leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] the House won a victory in the conference. I think the House should support the conferees and vote down the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the citizen gets a loan for construction and that loan is paid by the citizen, the Government does not put up the guarantee, and simply because the citizen meets his own obligation.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What has the Government furnished, then? The Government is carrying an insurance policy on the Federal housing, financed by local banks for the use of the citizen.

Mr. YATES. That is correct, except I should like to point out to the gentleman that I was attempting to enumerate the financial aids given by the Government to private enterprise for the construction of private housing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. One is money out of the tax box, the other is something entirely different.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows we make appropriations every year for the Federal National Mortgage Association, for example. The appropriations bill that will be considered tomorrow contains almost $1,000,000,000 for the Federal National Mortgage Association. That sum is being appropriated out of the taxpayers' pockets. It will be repaid later, it is true, but nevertheless there is a current appropriation for private housing purposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the $1,000,000,000 used for?

Mr. YATES. For secondary mortgages.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, sure, but again if the citizen pays the obligation, the Government does not have to pay it.

Mr. YATES. That is true, but the question we are debating is whether the Federal Government shall help those who cannot afford to purchase private housing or pay current rentals. I believe it should. To use the phrase of the senior Senator from Ohio, "I believe that if we desire to have reasonable equality of opportunity for the children of this country they must be allowed to grow up in a situation in which there is at least decent shelter in which families can live as human beings and can receive a start in life free from crime and free from the demoralization of character resulting from living in a slum area."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for so kindly yielding time to me.

We are in a situation here where an effort is being made to dress up a motion to recommit the conference report to the conferees, in order to scare those who want to vote for the 35,000 public-housing units into voting for it and killing the provision for these units. A vote could easily have been taken on each particular item of the four in the motion to recommit as it came up, but they have been lumped together in a motion to recommit expressly for that purpose. I will prove that, and I do not think any Member should be taken in by it. It is perfectly legitimate but my point is that no Member should succumb to that bait.

People in the big cities are going to be watching this vote. This is a public-housing vote. The conference report is giving them this year 35,000 units, 3.5 percent of the million housing units to be produced this year. Last year the Congress gave them 50,000, which is 5 percent. The House has just taken off most of the controls because Members apparently believed there were more materials available, and that the defense emergency is not too great a limitation on them. But that action on the Defense Production Act cannot be justified if at the same time a very minor percentage of public housing is being denied and reduced even below last year.

Now for the proof: What the movants hope for on this motion to recommit is to go back to the Senate and insist upon the amount the Senate gave for maritime training, not the amount the House gave; the amount the Senate gave is a few hundred thousand dollars more. I ask you, is that put in for window dressing or because they really and seriously are interested in taking that back to the Senate? Generally, they would be expected to insist on what the House did and not to try to get what the Senate did. No; this is a package to try to induce you to defeat this particular conference report because it contains a small 35,000 public-housing units. I hope you will not be taken in by it.

We have just lost seven people in a flash fire in substandard housing in New York. There are 50,000 such buildings in

the city of New York. The State and the city—and that is true of many of the great cities—have tried to meet this obligation for better housing and much has been done, but not nearly enough. They cannot meet it and the help of the Federal Government is urgently needed.

Forty percent of our population have families earning less than $3,000 per year. For that 40 percent of the population this conference report is providing only 3.5 percent of the housing units expected to be started in the next fiscal year.

I assure you the conference committee and the Appropriations Committee will be able to work out all of these problems about the veterans' hospitals and the other matters they are putting into this motion to recommit, if they want to, but what is being attempted by this kind of a motion is to scare those who are willing to give this bare fragment of public housing to the millions who need it so urgently, from doing it. I do not think we ought to be scared and I ask you to vote down the motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent that the motion to recommit is what might properly be termed a trick motion. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] pointed his finger at that very fact, and clearly conveyed to the Members of the House the combination of four factors which constitute nothing but a trick motion. Two of the hospitals that are involved here are in California I am informed. It would be very interesting to know some of the history that took place in the conference committee in relation to some of the items in dispute. The gentleman knows when he offers his motion to recommit that you cannot demand a separate vote on each one of the four items. If it was an amendment before the House, you could have a separate vote on the different items. You could have a separate vote on housing and you could have a separate vote on any one of the other three items, if any Member so demanded. But on a motion to recommit on a conference report, you cannot demand a separate vote on any of the component matters which constitute the motion to recommit. The 35,000 units for public housing is about one-half of what was recommended in the budget message of the President. As I remember, the President recommended appropriations which would build 75,000 housing units. When the Committee on Appropriations reported its appropriation bill, it provided an appropriation for 25,000 units. A motion was made to reduce it to 5,000 units, which on the roll call the House adopted. The other body inserted appropriations in the bill for 45,000 units, and the House conferees agreed upon 35,000 units, but, retained the so-called provision which prevents leap-frogging. The important part of this motion to recommit is public housing. There is no question about that, and the other part is the Jensen amendment. The other two items are just thrown in for the purpose of confusing and for the purpose of getting Members into an embarrassing position, if it can possibly be done. If this motion should prevail, I hope my friend, the gentleman from Texas, will cross up such an attempt and bring back in disagreement the various items. That is if the motion should prevail, and I hope it does not; I hope he will bring them back so that they can be put to the House on a separate vote, and thus prevent this trick motion to recommit from being carried successfully into operation.

We are going to either adjourn or recess on July 5. One thing is certain: We have to do that in connection with the two coming national conventions. That is the only fair thing to do. We would like to adjourn. If we cannot adjourn, we certainly will have to take a recess due to the fact that the Republican convention starts on July 7. If we are going to adjourn, we have to get the appropriation bills out of the way, and certainly we cannot take a chance, if we do expect to adjourn, on recommiting appropriation bills, because, in my opinion, that is the one thing which will prevent an adjournment sine die. I hope, in view of the trick motion which is offered, that it will not be carried, and that the House will not recommit the conference report, and I hope between now and July 5 the various appropriation bills will be disposed of so that we can adjourn sine die. It would be very interesting if it were possible to obtain the real history of what took place in the conference committee in relation to some of these veterans' hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion to recommit will be defeated.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope the House will not retreat from the stand it took on March 21 against socialized housing, when we had a record vote on that occasion.

I am not at all surprised that the advocates of public housing are at least satisfied with the so-called compromise of 35,000 socialized units, the construction of which will begin during the next fiscal year.

Let us see how much of a compromise this is. I hope, even though at this last minute when we are already hearing that warning that we are nearly through and that we have to rush things through without thinking them through, I hope the House will stand up this afternoon on this important issue and say that we can sit here until Christmas, if necessary, in support of the vital principle that is involved in this socialized housing program.

On March 21 the House, on a record vote of 168 to 192, announced that it wanted no more than 5,000 of the socialized housing units to be begun during the next fiscal year, including the so-called leapfrog provision that has been referred to, which was a fine thing. It went to the other body and there, by a very narrow margin, the House figure was not accepted. The vote was 31 to 37. A shift of three votes on the part of the other body would have accepted the so-called Fisher amendment and it would not even have been in conference. So apparently there is very substantial support in the other body for the position that the House took. Despite that fact, the conferees apparently not informed about the extent of the support which our position had in the Senate, instead of a compromise of a reasonable figure they go to 35,000. Now they come in and say, "Yes, but we have got the entire leapfrog provision in there so that they cannot commit themselves for future years." That is well and good, but it does not attack the evil that is involved in this socialized housing program. It does not do anything to help stop the evil of this thing that is going on.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, I could discuss a number of the factors that are involved. I have made some study of it recently, but we do not have very much time. The big cry you always hear is that this is slum clearance and we have to get rid of the slums. Recently I have seen repeated evidence of the fact that many of the larger projects are built on vacant land, practically built entirely on vacant land. Recently the city of Los Angeles in an important referendum voted 3 to 1 against a 10,000-unit program out there. The newspaper report said 80 percent of the land that was purchased for that construction was vacant, not slum clearance. Instance after instance of the same thing is going on all over the country. This is not a slum-clearance program. That is an incidental thing. It is a good vote-getter. It sounds good. Nobody is in favor of slums. But after all is said and done, it is one of the most expensive housing construction operations ever undertaken anywhere. If you will just study the details of this it is absolutely appalling. I will refer to it briefly.

These units actually cost, according to the figures put out by the Public Housing Authority, more than $12,000 in Federal subsidies donated to the local housing authorities, and which are applied on the payment of the bonds that are sold on Wall Street and throughout the country. Then the local contribution, after taking the "in lieu" contribution, amounts to about half that amount. Therefore, each individual unit is costing the American taxpayers, either on the local level or the Federal taxpayers, a total of more than $18,000. The total cost of the 30,000 units added in conference amounts to more than $500,000,000. The American taxpayers have to pay that. It would be much cheaper for the Government to donate these housing units to these people and not be bothered with this tremendous cost and all the social evils that are involved in it.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. The gentleman mentioned the Los Angeles situation. The voters of that city went to the polls and voted 3 to 2 against public housing in Los Angeles. Is the

gentleman aware of the fact that the Housing Administration has said it does not make any difference what the people of Los Angeles want; we have a valid contract with the city of Los Angeles; we are going to build the public housing there and it does not make a bit of difference what your people think about it?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is exactly correct; and it is amazing how inconsistent, how absolutely inconsistent the Public Housing people are in promoting these projects and foisting them upon the people all over the country. Would it surprise the gentleman to learn that in this bill they have nearly $1,000,000 for traveling expenses for this agency? This is for nearly a thousand people, I think 919—that they want to send all over the country just to traipse around and promote and impose this program, including many, many misrepresentations, I can assure the gentleman, imposed upon local city councils who do not know just what they are getting into; and many of them are begging and pleading to be released from the projects.

Mr. Speaker, a vote to recommit this conference report is a vote against socialized housing, a vote against recommiting is a vote for socialized housing.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Texas that we have but one speaker. Would it not be proper for him to use all but his last speaker on his side before I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. THOMAS. I will close the debate.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has no other speaker?

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York, Mr. TABER.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to clear up two or three things about this situation.

The increase above the House figures of 30,000 units: What does it mean? It means that every month after these housing units go into operation there is paid a subsidy of approximately $32.50 for every apartment or individual in a housing project. And what does that mean over the lifetime of the project? It means, as the gentleman from Texas has told you, $12,160 on 30,000 units; it means $364,800,000. That is what you are voting on; it is not any little subsidy; it is not any little item; it is, to my mind, a great big swindle, because you could hand these people dollar-free units to live in cheaper than that in almost any place in the United States. It is the most outrageous way of handling anything that I ever saw invented, and it is about time that we stopped that kind of contribution and subsidy.

There has been an effort here to dodge the issue. It was absolutely impossible to offer a motion to recommit this bill unless everything that we wanted to raise was put in it.

I am going to tell you because somebody who has preceded me expressed an interest in some of the things that took place over in the conference with reference to the veterans' hospitals. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] opposed accepting the approximately $100,000,000 cut that the Senate had made in veterans' hospitals and he specified the places where the need existed. He said there were insufficient neuropsychiatric hospitals to take care of the real serious veterans' cases resulting from the Korean situation. That is what took place and that is why he did not like it. He was the one who did the talking on the part of the minority.

Now, why do we want the Jensen amendment? Why do we need it? We need it for the protection of the Federal civil-service employees who are in the various departments so that the cuts and reductions that are made will not result in the firing of people. The normal attrition of these departments is in every case sufficient to take care of the reduction. That is the fair way to approach the matter, it is the honest way to approach it, and that is why so many of us have been anxious to have the Jensen amendment.

I hope the membership of the House will put its stamp of disapproval on further efforts at socialized housing with enormous subsidies, designed ultimately to break the United States, because the kind of housing they put up is never as good as the kind that private capital puts up. I hope that we can get down to a situation where we will permit ordinary folks to build houses instead of having the Federal Government do it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion to recommit will prevail.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the motion to recommit is not carried, will the items in dispute be taken up one by one for a vote?

Mr. TABER. No. If the motion to recommit fails, the previous question will be moved on the conference report, and you will have to vote it up or down. In other words, shall we take the conference report with everything in it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There will be no opportunity to vote on the hospitals and on the other items?

Mr. TABER. You cannot vote on anything except on the question of agreeing to the conference report.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it is an outrage to cut out the hospital here in Washington. The Mount Alto Hospital is horribly overcrowded. You cannot get men who are dying into it. It is an outrage to cut that out, and I think also there should be housing.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentlewoman is correct. There are 500 beds in Washington and there are 3,000 beds which we do need for the NP patients.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion to recommit will prevail and that we may have a better bill presented to us, and in saying that I am not throwing stones at the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], because he is a very able member of the Appropriations Committee and he handles things very cleverly. But the situation is such that we ought to have uppermost in our minds first the interest of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article appearing in the Washington Post.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post yesterday morning, buried back in the inside pages where many Members may have missed it, was a report by George Gallup, the director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, headlined "Majority Prefers Democrats as Best for Their Interests."

This survey by the Gallup poll shows that a clear majority of white-collar workers, of farmers, and of manual workers answered Democratic when asked "Looking ahead for the next few years, which political party—the Republican or Democratic—do you think will be best for people like yourself?" Business people, of course, answered the other way—that is understandable.

The atrocious actions taken on the bill before the House today to weaken the stabilization controls demonstrate clearly why the Gallup poll got the kind of answers it did to its question.

The Republican Party was in here fighting to get higher prices for business all down the line. At whose expense? At the expense of the rest of the people—of the consumer, the farmer, the white-collar worker, the teacher, the pensioner, the veteran, the workingman.

I know that some of our Republican colleagues have lost confidence in the Gallup poll because it was off base on the 1948 election. We all know what happened—the results came in from the field indicating a Democratic victory and the pollster experts just could not believe that was accurate, so they adjusted a little here and there. When the pollsters, however, ask fair, straight-out questions which put the issues clearly and squarely up to the person being interviewed—as this survey reported this morning did—and if they do not go adjusting the results but let them speak for themselves, then they are more likely to be accurate.

The solidarity of the Republican side of the House last Friday, yesterday, and today in jamming through some of the amendments on price control to give inflation another shot in the arm proves once again to the voters which party represents them and which party represents the special interests.

One thing Gallup points out is the sad state of the Republican Party's influence with the farmers. The farmer has been hurt by inflation, just like everyone else who has to work hard for a living. Amendments put in here last year to weaken price control did not help the farmer—although some of them were supposed to, according to their sponsors—but instead, they hurt the farmer

by raising the cost of everything he buys and reducing his income.

This article says:

The attitude of farmers in today's survey is of significance, particularly since it was the farm vote which helped Truman win in 1948. The farmers—

The article adds—

again give the nod to the Democrats today.

The complete article, Majority Prefers Democrats as Best for Their Interests, is as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

MAJORITY PREFER DEMOCRATS AS BEST FOR THEIR INTERESTS

PRINCETON, N. J., June 24.—When it comes to a question of self-interest or the "pocket-book nerve" of the American voter, the Democratic Party has an advantage over the GOP.

More people consider the Democratic Party best for people like themselves, than choose the Republicans, according to interviews just completed with a national cross section of voters.

The survey put this question to the voters interviewed:

"Looking ahead for the next few years, which political party—the Republican or Democratic—do you think will be best for people like yourself?"

The vote is:

	Percent
Democrats best	42
Republicans best	37
No difference	13
No opinion	8
	100

All those who voted "no difference" or "no opinion" were asked this second question:

"If you had to make up your mind today on which party has your best interest at heart—which would you choose, the Republican or Democratic Party?"

This showed 6 percent Republican, 6 percent Democratic and 9 percent still undecided—making up the 21 percent answering "no difference" or "no opinion" on the first question.

The results high light the central problem of the Republican Party in trying to win this year's election.

That is, many political observers believe that the "pocket-book nerve" influences the way many people vote.

The attitude of farmers in today's survey is of significance, particularly since it was the farm vote which helped Truman win in 1948.

The farmers again give the nod to the Democrats today.

Manual workers also indicate a marked preference for the Democratic Party, whereas business and professional people list the Republicans as best for their interests.

White-collar workers are more evenly divided with the Democratic Party being favored.

Here is the vote, combining the two questions, by occupation groups.

	Democrats best	Republicans best	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Business and professional	32	58	10
White collar	48	43	9
Farmers	50	42	8
Manual workers	54	37	9

President Truman's popularity has increased in recent weeks, although it still remains comparatively low.

Today's survey however, would indicate that the strength of the Democratic Party should be judged not in terms of Truman's popularity but in terms of the very evident appeal which the party has to the voting public.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE].

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I favor the adoption of the report of the committee, which recommends a compromise figure of 35,000 federal-aided dwelling units during the next fiscal year.

I believe this figure is too low. We need more public housing, not less.

Our public housing developments fulfill a definite need. They give decent housing at moderate rentals to our own people who could not afford it otherwise.

In New York City, for example, where the Bureau of Labor Statistics calculates that it take a minimum of $4,083 a year to support a family of four, only four-person families with incomes below $3,000 can be admitted to federally-aided housing projects. The rents average $37 per month. There is no place in New York City outside of public housing where families in this income category can find a decent place to live at a rental they can afford.

The projects built under the Housing Acts of 1937 and 1949 must meet the requirements established by the Public Housing Administration, which administers Federal aid to public housing. This means that we can be sure that every new apartment meets American standards so far as space, light, and air are concerned; that there is sufficient open space around the buildings for the children to play in—in short, that every apartment built is one which is fit for an American family to live in.

Although the Federal Government provides financial aid and sets up certain architectural and administrative standards which the local housing authorities must meet, the emphasis has been and still is on local initiative. The local housing authority selects the site for a new project, hires private architects to draw up the plans, lets contracts for construction of the project, and operates the project with its own personnel after construction is completed.

The country's housing authorities, by and large, have carried out their functions in a workmanlike and efficient manner. The authority with which I am best acquainted, of course, is the New York City Housing Authority. Under the leadership of its chairman, Philip J. Cruise, and its executive director, Gerald J. Carey, the New York City Housing Authority has achieved an enviable place among the most highly esteemed governmental agencies in the country. Governmental officials, architects, and engineers from every quarter of the globe, as well as from all parts of the United States, come to New York City each year to inspect the Authority's projects and to study its methods of operation. The Authority has been fortunate in being able to work with a city administration whose leaders, including Mayor Vincent R. Impellitteri and Comptroller Lazarus Joseph, are keenly aware of the need for low-rent housing in New York City. I want you to know that we are proud of our public-housing developments in New York City. They have razed slums which were eyesores and replaced them with modern buildings beautifully landscaped and affording plenty of light, air, and play space for children.

We still need public housing. The growth of our population; the substandard condition of a large portion of our supply of housing; the abnormal shortage of residential construction from 1930 through 1945; and the cost of homes built since 1946; are the reasons why we should continue our public-housing program.

We often tend to forget that the United States is still a growing country. Between 1930 and 1940 the population of the continental United States grew by 9,000,000. In the following 10-year period our population jumped by another 19,500,000, and since 1950 we have been expanding at an average of 2,500,000 each year.

In addition to providing homes for the huge increase in population, there has been and still is an urgent need to replace the tremendous number of slum dwellings and other substandard homes we had at the beginning of the period I have been discussing, as well as to replace the homes which have been destroyed by disasters such as floods and fires, or which have deteriorated to a point where they are no longer fit for human habitation. In 1950 we had 2,500,000 homes which were described by the Housing and Home Finance Agency as "dilapidated," an additional 4,000,000 without toilet or bath, and 2,000,000 more which had no running water of any kind. The picture of millions of American children growing up under such conditions is not one we can view with complacency.

During the period 1930–1952, with the exception of the last 6 years, the amount of residential construction has been far below normal. In the early 1930's the depression brought construction almost to a halt. Building activity improved later in the decade, bringing the total of dwelling units started between 1930 and 1940 to 2,700,000. With the start of World War II residential construction was paralyzed again. Even with the abnormally high rate of construction since 1946, the total number of units started between 1940 and 1950 was only 5,700,000. About 2,500,000 units have been started since 1950, making a total of about 10,900,000 for the period 1930 to 1952.

The rapid increase in construction costs since 1946 has of course, put new private housing far out of the reach of low-income families. Nor have a substantial number of old dwelling units been left vacant by the families who moved into postwar housing. Many of these families were newlyweds who had never had a home before; many of them had been sharing apartments with in-laws or relatives. It cannot be assumed, therefore, that every new home meant an

old apartment for a low-income family to move into.

For these reasons the need for public housing is still acute. The New York City Housing Authority, for example receives an average of 4,000 applications per month from families with incomes under $3,000 a year, in spite of the fact that it has a backlog of more than 500,000 applications. But there is no need to cite statistics on this point. Every time I take a walk through certain sections of my own district in the Borough of the Bronx, or in other sections of New York City, I am appalled by the thousands of ramshackle, overcrowded slum buildings in which so many of our families—many of them families of war veterans—must continue to live because they do not earn enough money to pay the rents demanded in available private housing.

At this point let me pause to bring to the attention of the Congress one specific area in my congressional district which shows the dire need for increased housing units. I refer specifically to what is known as the Washington-Claremont area of the borough of the Bronx, New York City. In this area there is a preponderance of old-law tenements. The area is known to have the oldest houses in the central Bronx. The buildings are not only old, but contain many violations. There are quite a few buildings in the area which were condemned and which, as a result of demands for increased housing, were reopened. Most of these buildings were so arranged as to provide single rooms for housing for entire families. The perniciousness of such an arrangement is pointed up by the fact that in one such reopened, condemned building there were five infant deaths within a short period of time.

This area is much more congested than the rest of the county of the Bronx with an average of 266 persons per occupied area, as compared with 66 persons elsewhere in the borough and 91 persons for the city as a whole. Health area No. 24, which includes most of the Washington-Claremont area I am referring to, has a population density that is even greater—355 persons per acre. This is hardly a desirable condition and militates against an adequate home life for children. Available information from the police department on juvenile delinquency in the area indicates that youth delinquency is more serious with substandard conditions and as a result, the forty-second precinct covering most of the Washington-Claremont area is one of the precincts having the highest volume of delinquents in the borough. The youth board for the area also reports that the highest incidents of delinquency in the borough of the Bronx are found in this area.

Similar conditions prevail in other cities, I am sure, and in rural areas as well.

I want to point out, however, that a continuation of our public housing construction program would benefit not only low-income families. There are millions of families in the middle-income category—let us say those with incomes of $4,000 to $8,000 a year—who are now living in quarters they consider inadequate because they are overcrowded or for other reasons and who are, of course, ineligible for low-rent public housing. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 provides for Federal assistance to cities which seek to redevelop slum areas by clearing the slums and selling the cleared areas to private investors for approved purposes, such as construction of apartment houses designed for middle-income families.

A number of projects have already been planned under title I of the 1949 Housing Act. The problem that arises in almost every case, however, is, what to do with the families who are now living in the old building which must be destroyed before the title I projects can be started. Many of these families are within the income limits for public housing, and it would be a comparatively simple matter to relocate them to new public housing projects to be completed within the next few years. Continuation of the public housing construction program, laid down in the Housing Act of 1949 is necessary in order to clear the title I on projects now in the planning or development state. The action we take on this bill will therefore affect middle-income families as well as low-income families.

Now we come to a point which is very important in these budget-conscious days—what would it cost the Government if we authorized the start of construction of 75,000 units in the coming fiscal year? Based on past experience with federally aided public housing, we can estimate that it would cost the United States more than $30,000,000 a year in subsidies for a period of not more than 40 years. This is certainly a modest price to pay for the addition of such valuable permanent assets to our economy—assets which will serve as an investment in democracy, and which will stand our people in good stead for the next century, come good times or bad, come peace or come war.

While we consider costs, we should also consider the cost of not continuing our public-housing-construction program. This is not a cost that can be measured in dollars and cents, but it is a very real cost nonetheless. It can be measured in terms of bad citizenship, of disease, of juvenile delinquency, of reduction in the number of young men who will be capable of meeting the Armed Forces' physical standards 5 years hence, 10 years hence, 25 years hence. The price of our failure to continue building decent homes for low-income families is far too high. We simply cannot afford to cut off Federal aid to low-rent housing.

In taking action on this bill, let us remember that ours is still a growing country—growing at the rate of 2,500,000 persons per year. The need for low-rent housing is going to increase, not decrease, and it is our duty to look to the future in making our decisions now. By the year 2000, the tanks, the planes, and the battleships for which we have appropriated billions of dollars—an expenditure which I think was and still is essential—will long since have been scrapped and forgotten, but the housing projects we build now will still be standing as proof to the historians of that era of the foresight and statesmanship of America's political leaders in the mid-twentieth century.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER].

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, if we slaughter the administration's public-housing program, we betray hundreds of thousands of our population in the lower income brackets who must rely upon us for adequate housing at prices they can pay. Furthermore, we would seriously obstruct our defense production and mobilization plans and efforts.

Shelter is an absolute necessity to everyone. Keeping a roof over their heads has become one of the gravest problems of all to our people. The housing shortage remains acute; we have never begun to catch up with the housing needs of our fast-growing population, and they have been pyramiding since the beginning of World War II. Before any constructive housing program could be put into effect and real results accomplished after the last war, we were forced again to channel materials to defense production. All this has somewhat hampered the building of homes and housing projects, but we must recognize the seriousness of the housing shortage and our duty to provide decent housing for the many thousands who are desperate for a place to live.

In any highly populated metropolitan area we find tragic housing conditions. Numbers of families are herded together in a small apartment; unhappiness, discontent, ill-health, juvenile delinquency are among the evils which are a direct result of poor housing conditions. Many persons are forced to live in a deplorable state—in basements overrun with vermin and rodents; in damp, dingy, uninhabitable places which are occupied only because there is no other place to go. Dozens of persons are forced to use the same kitchen and bath; children and babies sicken and die; lives are endangered—all because suitable housing is not to be had. The 1950 census figures show that more than 11,000,000 nonfarm dwellings are substandard. There is no excuse for this in this great country of ours; there is no good reason why every American should not be able to enjoy a decent place to live.

Veterans of World War II who looked forward to occupying their own homes after the war are still forced to live with relatives or in furnished rooms. A happy life with his wife and family in a place of his own is still only a dream to most veterans. After their sacrifices for their country the deserve better treatment than this from us.

When Congress passed the Housing Act of 1949 it promised our people that the underprivileged and ill-housed could look forward to housing they could afford. We authorized a level of 135,000 public-housing units per year, and even at that rate many persons could not expect relief for years. However, that number of units would have alleviated the housing shortage somewhat, and at least the people could hope.

At this time we are fighting those who would destroy the housing program, and who would utterly defeat the will of Congress as expressed in the Housing Act of 1949. They would betray those who expect us to keep our word now; they would undermine the faith of the people in their Congress. The enemies of the public-housing program are grasping at any excuse to sabotage the housing program at the expense of the homeless and helpless thousands who are relying upon us.

I maintain that there is no reason why we should not adhere to our original purpose and provide for the 135,000 units per year authorized heretofore. Granted, there are shortages of materials and that our defense program must have first consideration, we also know that private industry contemplates building 1,000,000 new units during the coming year. If private industry can accomplish that much, it is obvious that the Federal Government has no excuse for cutting its own housing program to the bone. We must remember that the persons Congress had in mind when it passed the Housing Act of 1949 will not be benefited by private industry's accomplishments; they cannot afford the homes now being built; low-cost housing is the only answer to the needs of those in the low-income brackets.

The proposed reduction in housing units in the bill now before us would result in serious hardship to the people of New York City where lack of housing is a heartbreaking and terrible problem. It would delay four-fifths of the federally aided public housing construction program for the coming year; would reduce the scheduled start of 10,581 apartments to a little more than 2,000. Projects in the entire New York area would be affected; planning would be delayed. The sad consequences of a reduced number of housing units cannot be measured, and what is true of New York is also true of thousands of other cities and communities in our country.

If we fail to provide housing for our people, we undermine our defense production program. We have been told by spokesmen for the aircraft industry that the Nation's critical housing shortage is a major reason for the dangerous lag in United States plane production. One aircraft corporation official in California recently stated that when his firm found it necessary to expand from 5,900 employees to its present 24,460 it had to hire 40,000 to reach that total because of the high turn-over due to lack of housing. He said that between 25 and 60 percent of all employees hired by four San Diego plane firms quit and returned east because of the lack of housing. This is only one example; many other important defense industries are similarly handicapped.

We must remember that those in the lower-income brackets are the very ones who carry the heaviest part of the defense load and who are called upon to make the greatest sacrifices. They are the laborers, the low-wage earners, the factory workers, who are turning out the ammunition, planes, and other defense-production items. They work until they are ready to drop; they are spending every ounce of physical and mental energy in the defense effort. Surely, they are entitled to a home when their day's work is done; they deserve to know that their families have decent living quarters, and that their children's health is not in jeopardy.

As I have said before, those in the lower-income brackets, the underprivileged, and the homeless, received our pledge of help in 1949. To break that promise would be a stark betrayal of all those whom we allowed to hope for decent housing. When we deny homes to our people, we take away more than shelter—we deny them security, peace, mental as well as physical health, and we weaken the fundamental structure of our democracy—for in a true democracy the home is the foundation.

Let us aim for the 135,000 units as originally planned in the Housing Act of 1949; let us fulfill our promises to the American people. I say there is no reason why we cannot do so. If we do not provide housing, we will fail miserably in our duty to our people and our responsibility for the security of our Nation.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the motion to recommit will prevail. I shall address myself to that portion of the motion referring to maritime training.

Mr. Speaker, the Kings Point Maritime Academy is in my district. About 10-years ago it was dedicated—in ceremonies in which the late President Roosevelt took part—to take its place alongside of Annapolis, West Point, and the Coast Guard Academy—another great national academy—to train men as officers in our merchant marine fleet.

Since the end of World War II only one group has raised its voice against Kings Point and that group is composed of maritime unions who apparently feel that their unions will be affected adversely if our maritime fleet is manned by graduates of Kings Point. No protest comes from any other source.

The records of Kings Point graduates are such that all of us can be justly proud of them.

The attempt to scuttle Kings Point each year should end. The cadets should continue to receive their monthly allowances, the Academy should be allowed to keep the teaching staff intact. A vote for this motion to recommit will insure this.

Mr. Speaker, the pride of America—the liner the *United States*—as we all know—is going to make her maiden voyage to England on the 3d of July.

I hope my colleagues will bear with me when I call attention to the fact that on this great ship there will be large representation in its officer personnel, by men who are graduates of the United States Maritime Academy at Kings Point, which is in my district.

The *United States* is going to try to smash the record of the *Queen Mary*, which has held the blue ribbon for crossing time since 1938. Many of us will recall that the *Queen Mary's* time was 3 days, 20 hours, 42 minutes. Her average speed was 31.69 knots.

There will be 52 deck and engine room officers who will be intent in their job to beat the *Queen Mary's* record.

I should like to point out that of the nine deck officers on board the *United States*, six are Kings Point graduates.

Of the 43 engine room officers, 12 are Kings Point graduates.

I know that the whole country will be watching the maiden voyage of the *United States* on July 3 next, and I think all of us are expecting that she stands better than simply a good chance to recapture for the United States the Atlantic crossing blue ribbon, which has been in British hands now for over 100 years.

We will be hoping that the United States will again win the speed record which she held for many years during the days of the clipper ships.

Kings Point will be very strongly in evidence when this ship sails, not alone in navigational personnel, but in engineering officers. The motive power of this ship is tremendous, developing 163,000 horsepower.

Under the captaincy of Harry Manning, Kings Point graduates who will be among the deck officers come from all over the United States .

The first deck officer of the ship—a Kings Point graduate of the class of 1942—is Richard W. Ridington, of Conshohocken, Pa. The third officer, another outstanding man, is John S. Tucker, of Belmont, Mass. He is a 1950 graduate.

Here are the names of additional deck officers on the *United States*, and I know that Members of Congress who represent them will welcome the information that their districts are intimately represented in the maiden voyage of the *United States:*

Third officer: Paul L. Krinsky, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Second officers: Asterio Alessandrelli, Louisiana; Samuel L. Ely, Zelienople, Pa.; Kenneth E. Pederson, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Here are the engine room officers.

The second officers are: Nicholas Landiak, Andover, N. J.; Joseph H. Lion, Arlington, Va.; Winton T. Ames, Hampton, Va.; William H. Van Cott, Elmhurst, N. Y.; Edward M. Almburg, St. Petersburg, Fla.

Third engineering officers are: Michael Squillace, Detroit, Mich.; James D'Andrea, Weatherby, Pa.

On this ship we also have three junior third engineering officers: Donald A. Prew, West Haven, Conn.; Arthur C. Taddei, Newport, R. I.; James B. Keating, Long Island City, N. Y.; and Louis Paehler, Brownsville, Tenn., and Lawrence C. McCloskey, Hamlin, Pa., both of whom are licensed junior engineers.

Throughout the years that Kings Point has been in operation, this great institution has paid a great return on the investment that our country has made there.

It is noteworthy that on this great new ship—the *United States*— we should have such a large representation of Kings Pointers. It goes to show that not only is Kings Point paying off in her contributions to our security program, through the creation of Naval Reserve

officers, but that she is making a vital contribution to our maritime industry.

Graduates of Kings Point are serving your country in vital capacities. Let us build up—not destroy—this great national institution.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now it is called socialized housing. The sloganeers are at it again. Anything for a name.

Sleep on stones and you are in free enterprise. Sleep in a low-income housing unit, and you are socialized. My, my.

Reminds me of Molière's Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme. The fellow got rich at midlife. Called a tutor. Asked him what he could learn. "Poetry, literature, prose, arithmetic." "Can you teach me prose?" "My dear sir," he was told, "you have been using it all your life."

Same with housing. From caves to the Eighty-second Congress, people have liked living under a roof. Only today if you want a home instead of a cup of coffee, and are willing to pay a modest price for it, but cannot get it, you are told to stop being socialized.

If some people could bottle up the sun they would sell you sunshine—at a price. And if you could not afford to buy it, but still wanted it, they would tell you to stop being socialistic. Same with oxygen. Too bad.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment to cut out the 35,000 housing units. I oppose the motion to recommit. I am for all the housing we can get.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the hour is growing late, and I would like to try to summarize this thing as fairly and as succinctly as I possibly can. But first I must acknowledge those kind words that my close personal friends, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said about me. I am so reminded about what happened down in my little home town of Nacogdoches, Tex. One of the old colored boys was having a birthday, and some member of the family called on Mose to congratulate him. And he did a good job congratulating Mose. But Mose said, "Boss, you are trying to substitute kind words for a nice present."

Well, my friends, seriously, if the committee has done a reasonably good job, back us up now. Now is the time. We have worked hard, and I will give you some facts and I know you will be delighted to hear them. It is once in a blue moon, and everybody on this floor knows it is true, that the House version prevails; that when the House has gone to conference with the Senate in the last 10 years, 99 out of every 100 times the Senate has raised us. Now, is that not true? No one will deny that. Yet we have done a reasonably good job. We bring you back a conference report that is $24,000,000 less than the amount you voted out of this House. No one will deny that.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. THOMAS. I cannot deny my friend.

Mr. TABER. If you figure in these extra 30,000 housing units, is is $340,000,000 more.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is exactly right. I am talking about the appropriated funds. I am not going to hide anything from you. And we are not counting $125,000,000 in one item, and another, where we said no telling how much, on the maritime item regarding payments for vessels lost where insured by the Government. We are talking about the appropriated funds, and this is the first time in many a year that a conference report has come back here at a lesser figure. We have always been raised. Can that be denied?

Mr. TABER. Oh, the Senate has almost always raised us.

Mr. THOMAS. Sure.

Mr. TABER. The conference reports have been higher, generally, than the House figure.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you so much. Then my statement is correct.

Let us get right down to specific things. As has been pointed out here, we have a Mother Hubbard motion to recommit, which is perfectly legal, and it cannot be separated. You have to vote it up or down.

First, let us take the housing problem. Last year and this year, for 2 years, your subcommittee has taken the punishment. It was the subcommittee that originated the cuts. It was the subcommittee that put the tough language in. Now, give us credit for that. It had not been done before.

If the House wants to take this subcommittee to task, even after we have restored that tough language, and you know it is tough, if the House wants to kill this thing, why not kill it entirely? You have that opportunity. Do not wait till your subcommittee takes all the punishment on this cutting and then come in and say you do not like what we have done.

We are going to do the best we can with whatever instructions you may give us. I hope you do not give us any, but we are not going to quibble with you, we are not going to cry, we are going to do whatever you tell us to do and we are going to do it the best we can. Whether we can do what you suggest is another thing.

Bear in mind the other body is one-half of the show. Bear in mind that they are elected for 6 years and we are elected for only 2 years, so they can stay here about three times as long as we can if they want to assert their prerogatives.

What did they do? They kicked out the tough language. Let us be honest about it. You know, your language is far more important than the number of your units, and I will explain it to any fair-minded person on this floor, and you are all fair. I believe in you.

Someone said something about Los Angeles. If you had had this tough House language you would never have had the Los Angeles situation. There it is. They had a contract for $100,000,000. The people repudiated it. But they had their legal representatives, the people had authority, they had bound them with a contract, and now the people say, "We do not want it." Now, it is a contract, yet the people say, "We want out of it."

I might add that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in an effort to be helpful to his people in California—and Los Angeles is not in his district—and the committee went several miles out of their way to help straighten out that situation. Let the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] do the testifying. I believe he will testify that it is just about satisfactorily straightened out by virtue of your subcommittee trying to help.

Again we go back over to the Senate and say, "You knocked out that tough language, but now you see the light and put it back in. Now we want you to back up on your own language." Of course, they can say to us, "Well, we will give you maybe your 5,000, but we want you to kick out your tough language." Where would you be then?

Without your tough language, and I say this to my good southern friends, and I am still one of you, and I say to my good friends over here that without this tough House language, and there are 610,000 units uncommitted out of the 810,000 authorized in the bill, they can tomorrow commit the whole 610,000 units, and you would be obligated to build them.

Again, my distinguished friend from Texas was wrong. It is not a partial payment by the taxpayers of the United States for these houses, it is a 100 percent payment.

It is going to cost you $336,000,000 a year for 40 years. Roughly that is just about $13,500,000,000, and it is a 100 percent contribution. Now by keeping this tough language of the House in, you have it in the palm of your hand and they can never build them unless you authorize it. Do you want to swap off the difference between 35,000 and 5,000 units for 610,000? You are too good at arithmetic for that; are you not? I am talking now to the people who want to kill the bill altogether.

I have been honest and frank with you to the best of my ability. There is the picture. If you want to send it back we are going to do the best we can for you, but remember the other body can sit here three times as long as we can, and they are a coequal part of the Congress with the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the other item I wish to call to the attention of the House is the amendment of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa. We all admire and we all love BEN JENSEN. This bill carried that amendment last year. On top of that amendment which was carried last year, what did your subcommittee do? Now listen to me. We made those agencies, every one of them with perhaps one little exception, absorb that 10 percent pay raise. That is a cut in personnel. A good many of these agencies had increased duties, there is no getting around that. Because you passed the laws last year telling them to do these things. That is not the fault of the agencies, and certainly

it is no fault of your subcommittee. The other body threw out the Jensen amendment and substituted the Ferguson amendment. Your conferees asked them to yield on both points, and they did. The reason they did is because we took the figures, and I have them here, agency by agency, and I can give you the exact dollars and cents, if you want me to take the time to read them, but anyway your regular subcommittee cuts in personnel costs as they left the House, were $85,000,000, and under the Ferguson amendment they were $40,000,000. So you cut just about 105 percent deeper than the Ferguson amendment.

The Jensen amendment says 10 percent—not below the budget estimate—no—your subcommittee and this House cut as deeply as that. The Jensen amendment says 10 percent on top of what you have already cut. But then it says with "with several exceptions" and one is the General Accounting Office, one is employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3, amounting to about 14,000 employees and then there are about 127,000 Veterans' Administration employees excepted. There are only 282,000 positions in the entire independent offices bill as presented in the budget, and yet 55 percent of them are exempted at one fell swoop.

I am not saying anything about what is provided in the other bills, but this House has already cut this independent offices bill as deeply as it can be cut. Frankly, the Jensen amendment would go deeper because it says 10 percent below that which you have already cut, but when you exempt 55 percent of them, the cut would be very, very little.

Yet some of these regulatory agencies, like the Interstate Commerce Commission, have been cut too much. A great many of our colleagues have come to the subcommittee one by one and said, "This agency has been cut too much. This one has been cut too much." There is more truth than poetry in it. So I respectfully ask you not to send this bill back to conference.

Those are the two big things. The other is martime training, which will add to the bill $500,000 increase on the taxpayers, all to subsidize a single industry. That is all it is.

The other item has to do with veterans hospitals. If I may, I will tell you what happened in conference. It is no secret. There was nothing happened in conference that was irregular. In fact, I had to admire JOHN PHILLIPS, if I may affectionately call him that in violation of the rules of the House. The Senate cut out five hospitals, two in California, two in Ohio, and one in the District of Columbia, at a total cost of $87,000,000. There have been hundreds of newspaper articles written in our daily papers, and I am surprised at my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. TABER], because he said many time that we had too many bed vacancies. Of course, he was right, The facts proved it.

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

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

Mr. TABER. That was on the beds that were vacant, and they are in the medical section rather than the neuropsychiatric.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right, but they are still vacancies. You have always been against building more hospitals. Now you ask us to build five more.

Now, in conference, here is where you have to admire him—I went down to Mr. PHILLIPS and I said, "If you need an NP hospital in California, your population has increased, we know that, say so. Now is the time to write it in here." He said, "I am not talking for my own district." You have to admire the gentleman, do you not? I renew that proposition now. I know that California is growing fast, and when we come back here if JOHN PHILLIPS says California has to have a hospital, I will lead the procession for you, Mr. PHILLIPS.

None from Illinois were cut out. Now, there is a situation. We have a 20 percent bed vacancy in a great many hospitals.

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

Mr. THOMAS. In just a moment, if I have time.

You are still under your authorized program of $822,500,000. You are still going to complete and put in operation 59 hospitals. With the old ones and the new ones you will have 179 hospitals in operation throughout the United States for the veterans by June 30, 1953. We all know that the vacancies run from 5 to 20 percent, and in a great many it is more than 20 percent. We have put $15,000,000 in this bill this year, and we will double it next year, whatever the budget estimate is, to convert these vacant general hospital beds into neuropsychiatric beds. Now, that makes sense. You have started that program this year and we will continue it and we will give them every dollar that the budget requests, and if the budget does not request enough we will go over the budget for that purpose, and that will take care of these five hospitals.

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

All time has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope you will vote down this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PHILLIPS moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 7072, to the committee of conference, with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House provisions on the number of housing units to be commenced in fiscal year 1953 (item 47); on the inclusion of the money necessary for new hospital construction (item 82), and on the orderly formula for personnel replacement contained in the so-called Jensen amendment (item 128), and further, to insist on the Senate provisions for the appropriations for maritime training (items 97 to 103, inclusive).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS) there were—ayes 144, noes 150.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 181, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—195

Abbitt	Gavin	Nelson
Adair	George	Nicholson
Allen, Calif.	Golden	Norblad
Allen, Ill.	Goodwin	Norrell
Andersen, H. Carl	Graham	O'Hara
Anderson, Calif.	Greenwood	Osmers
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Ostertag
Arends	Gwinn	Patten
Armstrong	Hagen	Patterson
Auchincloss	Hale	Phillips
Ayres	Hall, Leonard W.	Poage
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Potter
Beamer	Harden	Poulson
Belcher	Harrison, Nebr.	Prouty
Berry	Harrison, Va.	Radwan
Betts	Harrison, Wyo.	Redden
Bishop	Harvey	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Herlong	Reed, N. Y.
Bow	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Bramblett	Hill	Regan
Bray	Hillings	Riehlman
Brehm	Hinshaw	Rivers
Brooks	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.
Brownson	Hope	Ross
Bryson	Horan	Sadlak
Budge	Hunter	St. George
Buffett	Ikard	Saylor
Burleson	Jackson, Calif.	Schenck
Busbey	James	Scrivner
Bush	Jenison	Scudder
Butler	Jenkins	Secrest
Byrnes	Jensen	Shafer
Chatham	Johnson	Sheehan
Chenoweth	Jonas	Short
Chiperfield	Jones, Hamilton C.	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Jones, Woodrow W.	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	Kearney	Smith, Kans.
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Smith Va.
Colmer	Keating	Smith, Wis.
Cooley	Kersten, Wis.	Springer
Corbett	Kilburn	Stanley
Cotton	Kilday	Stockman
Cox	King, Pa.	Taber
Crawford	Larcade	Talle
Crumpacker	Latham	Teague
Cunningham	LeCompte	Thompson, Mich.
Curtis, Mo.	Lovre	Vail
Curtis, Nebr.	Lucas	Van Pelt
Dague	McConnell	Van Zandt
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Velde
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Vorys
Denny	McGregor	Vursell
Devereux	McIntire	Weichel
D'Ewart	McVey	Werdel
Dolliver	Mack, Wash.	Wharton
Dondero	Mahon	Wheeler
Durham	Martin, Iowa	Wigglesworth
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Williams, Miss.
Elston	Meader	Williams, N. Y.
Fernandez	Miller, Md.	Willis
Fisher	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Tex.
Ford	Miller, N. Y.	Winstead
Gamble	Murray	Wolcott
Gathings		Wood, Ga.
		Wood, Idaho

NAYS—181

Andrews	Bentsen	Camp
Anfuso	Blatnik	Canfield
Angell	Boggs, Del.	Cannon
Bailey	Boggs, La.	Carrigg
Baker	Bolling	Case
Bakewell	Bolton	Celler
Baring	Bosone	Chelf
Barrett	Brown, Ga.	Chudoff
Battle	Buchanan	Clemente
Beall	Buckley	Combs
Bender	Burnside	Cooper
Bennett, Fla.	Burton	Coudert

Crosser	Hull	O'Konski
Dawson	Irving	O'Neill
Deane	Jackson, Wash.	O'Toole
DeGraffenried	Jarman	Passman
Delaney	Javits	Patman
Denton	Jones, Ala.	Perkins
Dingell	Jones, Mo.	Philbin
Dollinger	Judd	Polk
Donohue	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Donovan	Kean	Price
Dorn	Kelley, Pa.	Priest
Doyle	Kelly, N. Y.	Rabaut
Eberharter	Kennedy	Rains
Elliott	Keogh	Reams
Engle	Kerr	Rhodes
Fallon	King, Calif.	Ribicoff
Feighan	Klein	Riley
Fine	Kluczynski	Roberts
Flood	Lane	Rodino
Fogarty	Lanham	Rogers, Colo.
Forand	Lantaff	Rogers, Fla.
Forrester	Lesinski	Rooney
Fugate	Lind	Roosevelt
Fulton	McCarthy	Scott, Hardie
Furcolo	McCormack	Scott,
Garmatz	McGrath	Hugh D., Jr.
Gary	McGuire	Seely-Brown
Gordon	McKinnon	Shelley
Granahan	McMullen	Sheppard
Granger	Machrowicz	Sieminski
Grant	Mack, Ill.	Sikes
Green	Madden	Sittler
Gregory	Magee	Smith, Miss.
Hall,	Mansfield	Staggers
Edwin Arthur	Marshall	Taylor
Hand	Merrow	Thomas
Hardy	Miller, Calif.	Thornberry
Harris	Mills	Tollefson
Hart	Morano	Walter
Havenner	Morgan	Watts
Hays, Ark.	Morrison	Whitten
Hays, Ohio	Moulder	Widnall
Heffernan	Multer	Wier
Heller	Mumma	Wilson, Ind.
Herter	Murdock	Withrow
Heselton	Murphy	Wolverton
Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.	Yates
Holmes	O'Brien, Mich.	Yorty
Howell	O'Brien, N. Y.	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—55

Aandahl	Eaton	Rankin
Abernethy	Evins	Reece, Tenn.
Addonizio	Fenton	Richards
Albert	Frazier	Robeson
Allen, La.	Gore	Sabath
Aspinall	Hébert	Sasscer
Barden	Hedrick	Spence
Bates, Ky.	Hoffman, Ill.	Steed
Beckworth	Kee	Stigler
Bennett, Mich.	Kirwan	Sutton
Bonner	Lyle	Tackett
Boykin	McMillan	Thompson, Tex.
Burdick	Mason	Trimble
Carlyle	Mitchell	Vinson
Carnahan	Morris	Welch
Cole, N. Y.	Morton	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Pickett	Woodruff
Dempsey	Powell	
Doughton	Ramsay	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Addonizio against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Welch against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bates of Kentucky against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 522)

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 Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the third special report on the operations and policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in accordance with section 4 (b) (6) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

This report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covers the 2-year period ending March 31, 1952. The first special report on the Fund and Bank was submitted in May 1948 and the second such report was submitted in May 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1952.*

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 523)

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 Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from October 1, 1951, to March 31, 1952, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1952.*

CONSTITUTION OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. BOW. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the friends of Puerto Rico are deeply concerned regarding the Senate amendment of the resolution approving the Constitution of Puerto Rico.

The Congress, like an individual, becomes the target of ridicule and suspicion when a promise is broken.

Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress granted the people of Puerto Rico the right to adopt their own constitution. Certain limitations were contained in that act—"no amendment to this constitution shall alter the republican form of Government established by it or abolish its Bill of Rights."

On June 4, 1951, 506,185 American citizens—registered voters of Puerto Rico, with full confidence in the Congress—voted on the constitutional referendum, that is, to adopt Public Law 600; 387,016 voted in favor of a constitutional convention.

On August 27, 1951, 92 delegates were elected by the people of Puerto Rico to a constitutional convention created under authority of Congress. For 62 days they labored and deliberated—delegates composed of all walks of life and from three of the major political parties of the Island.

On March 3, 1952, 457,562 American citizens—again exercising the right of franchise—voted on the adoption of the Constitution written by these citizens of the United States under the authority of Congress; 374,649 voters—82 percent—cast their ballots in favor of adoption of their constitution.

I witnessed this election. Some of the aged were taken to the polling places on stretchers so that they might vote. I saw literally thousands in rural areas walking miles through the hot sun to the polling places to exercise their rights which, as a proud people, they cherish—rights given them by Congress—the right of self-government.

In addition to Public Law 600, both major political parties made pledges to the people of Puerto Rico. The Democratic platform of 1948 stated:

> We urge • • • immediate determination by the people of Puerto Rico as to their form of government and their ultimate status with respect to the United States.

The Republican platform of 1948 stated:

> We favor eventual statehood for • • • Puerto Rico.

Both pledges are clear and without reservation.

The amendment to the Senate Resolution provides "that no amendment to the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be effective until approved by the Congress of the United States."

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that a one-man lobby, Leonard D. Long, of

South Carolina, has succeeded in thwarting the aspirations of more than 2,000,000 American citizens in Puerto Rico. This man is being sued by the Government of Puerto Rico for $1,000,000 in unpaid taxes. He has publicly threatened to use his money and influence to defeat the constitution which the people approved on March 3, 1952, by a 4 to 1 vote.

Through his press agents in Miami, led by Arthur Curtis, Long has paid for a campaign of vilification against Governor Muñoz-Marín and the administration in Puerto Rico.

If the House accepts the emasculated Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which the Senate has approved, Leonard D. Long will have convinced 2,000,000 American citizens in Puerto Rico and liberty-loving peoples of the world that our high-sounding protestations of anticolonialism are insincere to the degree that one man, such as Leonard D. Long, can wield more power than can the entire people of Puerto Rico.

Here is a situation where an individual has found an honest government he cannot buy—so he seeks to destroy it.

Mr. Speaker, if it were not so late in this Congress, I would introduce a resolution asking for an investigation of Leonard D. Long and his activities in Puerto Rico; I would ask for an investigation of F. D'a Carpenter, formerly with FHA in Puerto Rico, who was removed from his post; of Herman Bailey, formerly with FHA in South Carolina, who resigned shortly after Carpenter was fired. I think the Congress should know who paid Bailey's expenses at luxury hotels in San Juan.

It would also be interesting to know what connection, if any, Franklin D. Richards had in the Long activities in Puerto Rico. Such an investigation might properly be the subject of action in the Eighty-third Congress.

I say now, Mr. Speaker, in the Eighty-third Congress one of my first acts will be to introduce a bill to amend the resolution approving the constitution by striking out the amendment inserted by the Senate requiring congressional approval of constitutional amendments. I hope this will be done in conference now.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a "constitution," as we use that word with reference to civil government, means the framework, the fundamental, organic law of a nation, State, or commonwealth.

The virtue of a written constitution is that it is adopted by the people in their sovereign capacity as electors; it can be changed only by the people; it is as binding upon departments and officers of the Government as upon the individual citizen.

Like the constitutions of the several States, the constitution of Puerto Rico must conform to the Constitution of the United States. No language inserted by the Senate can create a greater safeguard against improper amendments than the Federal Constitution.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the people of South Carolina would say if we passed a law requiring them to submit any amendments to their constitution? Would not the ghost of 1861 rise and fight again?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conclude without paying tribute to a great American, the Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Marín. He is the first elected native governor of the islands.

His first and foremost interest is the United States. He feels that a strong, thriving Puerto Rico is in our best national interest. Each time he accomplishes his ambition to better the life and progress of his island, he puts the accomplishment on display in the showcase of Latin and South America, for that is Puerto Rico.

What we do now, Mr. Speaker, will live in memories for many years. We can keep our word and recognize the dignity of man. We can grant self-government to worthy and qualified citizens of the United States—or, we can destroy good will in Latin and South America. We can offend several million fine American citizens. We can break faith with hundreds of the dead of Puerto Rico's Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment now lying in their graves in Korea.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from a cablegram I have received from the distinguished Governor of Puerto Rico:

FRANK T. BOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

No blow against the hopes of our people could have been harsher than amendment to constitution in the Senate which takes away all sense of political equality from this constitution process that we have all engaged in such high hopes and good faith. A constitution that cannot be amended by the people to whom it applies within definite limits previously accepted freely by themselves, such as the limits in law 600 and the applicable provision of the Federal Constitution, is not a constitution at all. Free citizens can be conceived to accept such limitations, but not to have voted to consent to them. I earnestly hope that a remedy can be found in conference committee. If the desire is to create the legal assurance that section 20 would not be put back in the future nor section 5 modified again to its original language specific provisions could be made to that end without doing the most serious moral harm to a very fine good people who are your loyal fellow citizens.

Best regards,

LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REDDEN asked and was given permission to adress the House on Monday next for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

PROCEEDS FROM SPORTING EVENTS CONDUCTED FOR AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2282)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 23 (o) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions by individuals for charitable contributions) is hereby amended by striking out '15 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '20 per centum'.

"(b) Section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to unlimited deduction for charitable and other contributions) is hereby amended by striking out '15 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '20 per centum'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, and for other purposes."

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House provides that, subject to certain limitations, a corporation primarily engaged in the furnishing of sports programs may conduct a sports program exclusively for the benefit of the American National Red Cross without including the proceeds from the program in its gross income.

The Senate amendments make no change in the provisions of the House bill relating to the American National Red Cross. However, the Senate amendments provide for the amendment of section 23 (o) of the

Internal Revenue Code so as to increase, from 15 to 20 percent of an individual's adjusted gross income, the limit for income-tax deductions for individuals for contributions to charitable, educational, religious, and other organizations specified in such section 23 (o).

The effect of the action recommended in the accompanying conference report would be to adopt the substance of the Senate amendments, together with a technical amendment to section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code changing the cross-reference in such section to section 23 (o) of the Code.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous conference report.

I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I submitted an article for extension in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am advised by the Public Printer it will require two and three-quarter pages at an additional cost of $231. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 684, relative to establishment of the seaward boundaries of inland waters and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Wednesday next and 1 hour on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday, July 3, and that the special order granted him for today be vacated.

NAVAL CARRIER AIRCRAFT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and interest that I invite the attention of the House to the performance of the naval aircraft flown from carriers in the attack on the North Korean power plants. The New York Times of yesterday reports that the hydroelectric power complexes at Suiho located near the northwest corner of Korea were attacked on June 23 by Navy dive bombers launched from aircraft carriers operating off the east coast of Korea in the Sea of Japan.

Douglas Skyraider aircraft, each carrying 5,000 pounds of bombs, made the initial attack on Suiho supported by carrier based (F9F) Panther Jet Fighters to attack the defending antiaircraft guns. Ninety tons of bombs were used to destroy this plant.

The Navy attack aircraft were followed on the target by Air Force F84 Thunder Jet Fighter bombers. The power plant suffered many direct hits, and is believed to be destroyed. Other installations were heavily damaged.

These planes came all the way across Korea from the Sea of Japan to deliver a surprising and devastating attack with almost surgical precision. Mr. Speaker, I hope that it will be noted how a relatively few number of planes can be used effectively. If ever proof were clear, I am satisfied that the mobility, flexibility, precision and readiness of carrier-based planes are warrant for this Nation's urgent need for aircraft carriers as a part of our country's power in the air.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the House will place the carrier back in the appropriation bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the roll was called today on the Talle amendment I was unavoidably detained in other duties and I did not have the opportunity to cast my vote. Had I been present I would have voted for the Talle amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1951, I introduced H. R. 1271, a bill to amend section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the exemption from the child labor provisions of such act of certain employees employed in agriculture. Subsequent to the introduction of this bill a number of other Members of this Congress introduced similar bills to solve the same problem. All of these Members were thoroughly familiar with the problem to be solved and are to be highly commended for their interest in the matter. Immediately after these bills were filed, word went out from some source that the bills were designed to exploit child labor and the Members began to receive communications from all directions condemning these bills. I take violent exception to the sinister method that was employed in misrepresenting the true purposes of this legislation. Most of the mail that I received on the matter came from sources outside of my district and in the great majority of instances from sources outside my State. Also most of these communications were from city dwellers who had not the slightest conception of the problems of the farmer or the plight faced by many members of American society who depend upon harvest work for their livelihood. These communications came from people who would be the first to cry and complain if the supply of food, clothing, and other farm products were curtailed because of inability on the part of the farmer to harvest his products. They set up a great hue and cry about having the interest of children at heart. I yield to no one in my interest for the welfare of children. As most of you know, I have a sizable family, and do my best to take care of them. Certainly if there is anyone in the United States who is primarily interested in the welfare of children, it is the gentleman from Texas who is addressing you now. The truth is that these centralized Government advocates, who know how to run everybody's business but their own, have done a great injury to a large segment of American society and at the same time have exempted from the application of the law certain entertainment fields that produce no products for human consumption or raiment.

I want to give you a brief history of the situation so that you will understand what has and will be done under this legislation unless it is corrected as I have suggested in my bill. In the original Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 it was provided that the oppressive child labor provisions would not be applicable to children employed in agriculture except while they were legally required to attend school. Under this provision the question of whether or not a child could or could not be employed in agriculture depended upon the State laws, both labor

and school attendance laws. Those are the laws that should have controlled. However, the Department of Labor, in its efforts to assume jurisdiction over the entire citizenry of the United States, received reports from its various agents that they were finding it difficult to keep up with the State laws and to carry out the purpose that they had intended to carry out by the Fair Labor Standards Act, that is, to control and regulate the activities of working people all over this country regardless of the field in which they were employed. However, they were unsuccessful in getting any changes in the law until 1949, at which time they prepared and submited some language that was most innocent looking with which they proposed to correct the Fair Labor Standards Act, and so told the Congress. The language was devised as an amendment to section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act and reads as follows:

> The provisions of section 12 of this title relating to child labor shall not apply with respect to any employee employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while so employed, or to any child employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions or in radio or television productions.

Section 13 (d) was also added, which provided as follows:

> The provisions of sections 6, 7, and 12 of this title shall not apply with respect to any employee engaged in the delivering of newspapers to the consumers.

The effect of these amendments was to say this: that the provisions of section 12 (c) which read as follows: "No employer shall employ any oppressive child labor in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," do not apply to any child employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions or in radio or television productions, or to any employee engaged in delivering newspapers to the consumers, and does not apply to children working in agriculture on the condition that the children working in agriculture cannot so work while school is in session in the district where they are working. If this last condition was a good condition to put on children working in agriculture, I ask the simple question: "Why was it not a good condition to put on child actors, performers, and newspaper boys?" The truth is that agricultural work is not oppressive child labor and the act so declares.

In other words, if this language is so good, as the Department of Labor would have you believe, why did not they insist that it apply to everyone alike? Only recently the Congress passed a bill providing that children could be allowed to appear in the District of Columbia in theatrical performances late at night. I ask you, is it good sense to penalize a child of poor parentage who in many instances is called upon to help in feeding and clothing himself and the other members of his family, while at the same time special laws are passed so that theatergoers may enjoy seeing a small child traipse across the stage at 11:30 p. m.? What kind of business is it that denies to an American child the right to learn that advancement in life must depend upon one's individual ability to work and assume responsibility?

I have had numerous conferences with the officials of the Department of Labor, from the Secretary of Labor down through the ranks, in an effort to remedy the situation by administrative application. In every instance I have been advised that the Department is looking out for the welfare of children and does not intend to change the interpretations of the law under which they are now proceeding. I have asked them why they exempt the different business that I named above, the theatrical and other groups. Their only explanation is that in those fields arrangement is made for the education of those children separate and apart from the public-school proceedings. The thought occurred to me, and has caused me much concern, that all of the records of this Congress and several preceding Congresses have divulged a number of Communists and Communist fellow travelers in several industries. But none of the records of the Congress have divulged any Communists or fellow travelers among the farmers or their helpers. Are they trying to instill in these children that they are charges of the State and will be taken care of by the State? Such a program would eventually lead to the child refusing to recognize the authority of his own parents and saying, "I do not have to work; the Government through the Department of Labor is going to look after me." That is not the kind of principle that this country was built on. I worked in the harvest fields when I was a child, as did many of the other children in my community and in my State, and I challenge any group of people anywhere to show me better Americans than live in the State of Texas. The officials of the Department of Labor told me that under the 1938 act they found it most difficult to enforce the law. What they meant was that they found it difficult to accomplish the purpose that they set out to accomplish in the first instance, and that was to centralize control over all workers in the United States, every man, woman, and child, and to regiment them under Federal edict. Of course, none of us should expect these Federal workers to extend themselves insofar as their responsibilities are concerned. Are we supposed to pass laws to make it easier for them to perform their duties and dictate to the taxpayers that are paying the bills, so that they will be sure to have plenty of holidays and be in good physical shape to enjoy them? I say "No." I charge that the 1949 amendment (13c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which I have above referred to, has not helped the children of this country, but on the contrary, has done irreparable injury to the economy of a large segment of American society, and I stand ready to prove my charges.

I represent a district in West Texas that is overflowing with sound, solid basic Americans who have been brought up on the principle that in order to reap you must sow. The south end of my district produces a great amount of cotton, as does the district of the Honorable GEORGE MAHON, the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, and the Honorable FRANK IKARD, who have worked hard to correct the situation. Since this section of the country has been inhabited, the crops have been harvested by migrant workers of several nationalities and colors, including those of Latin-American descent, those of Negro descent, and many white families. This of course has been a tradition with these people, who begin their activities in the lower Rio Grande Valley where the crops are early. They harvest these crops and work north as the harvest season progresses in that direction. They get into the northern part of Mr. MAHON'S district, Mr. BURLESON'S district, and Mr. IKARD'S district in the late summer and early fall, and on into my district and into Colorado, the Panhandle of Oklahoma, and Kansas in the early and late fall. The great majority then return to their homes in the southern part of Texas, where they and their forebears have lived for generations. By following this method they accumulate enough money during that season of the year to provide them with sufficient sustenance through the winter and to enable them to send their children to school and to properly clothe and feed them. These people are a closely knitted people insofar as family life is concerned, and the family usually travels together in a group with other families. They have their children with them, and those who are large enough help their parents in the fields in harvesting the products. In my particular district the harvesting of cotton is commonly referred to as "boll pulling," that is, the entire boll is pulled off the stalk and subsequently carried to the gin where the cotton is separated from the seed and the boll. This, of course, is paid for by weight, that is, so much for each hundred pounds of bolls pulled.

A family with several children, and many of them have 8, 10, and 12, can by working together earn enough money during the harvest season to give them a good living during the winter and spring months. The children are under the constant surveillance of their parents and obey them. The family ties are strong, and the families work as a unit cooperating one with the other. These families flood the post offices in our section of the country with postal money orders which they are sending home as savings to see them through the winter and spring. In 1950, the year that the 1949 monstrosity amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act first went into effect, these people, in complete ignorance of what had been done to them, their economy and their families, blissfully commenced their operations as they, their fathers, and grandfathers had done. When they reached my district and the northern part of Mr. MAHON'S district, they were confronted by agents of the Department of Labor who advised the farmers that if they hired the children, they could be taken into court and fined $10,000, that these children were supposed to be in school because school was in session in the districts where the farm products were ready for harvest. The

farmers became frightened, as they, too, were wholly unaware of what the fast boys in Washington had pulled. The school authorities in these districts understood that a Federal law had been passed requiring these children to be placed in school. Nothing was done by the Federal agents to straighten out that misunderstanding. The Federal Fair Labor Standards Act is not a compulsory school attendance act. There is no provision in it which requires a child to attend school. This was not told to these people, and they, in their desire to abide by the law regardless of how damaging it might be, tried to work the children of these migrant workers into the schools. The result was that the school facilities were absolutely inadequate. Children of Latin-American descent who could not speak English were placed in schoolrooms with children who were in regular attendance in the schools. The result was that the migrant children in many instances did not know when to turn the page of the book unless they watched their seatmate or some other child in the schoolroom. The situation also presented a health problem, as you can well understand, in these overcrowded, congested schoolrooms.

The migrant workers did not understand, and the farmers did not understand. The migrant workers soon found out that the mother and father of seven or eight children ranging between the ages of 4 and 14 years could not possibly pull enough bolls in a day to feed 10 hungry mouths, much less clothe them. They also found out that the children who were under school age quickly noticed the separation of the family and were much harder to control on the site of the field where the mother and father were trying to work, than they ever had been before. The situation left the migrant workers with two choices. One was to appeal to the public-welfare authorities for assistance, and this many of them did. The public-welfare authorities soon discovered that they were confronted with a problem with which they were not remotely prepared to cope. Efforts were made by these authorities, but the funds for that purpose were quickly exhausted and there were no more to be had. The other choice left to the migrant worker was to return to his home in south Texas and half starve himself and his family through the winter months without sufficient funds to clothe his children so that they could attend school. The situation that was faced by these migrant workers also shook their very character to the roots. I have had many of them plead with me with tears in their eyes to help them out so that they could work and meet their own responsibilities.

To give you one pointed example I tell you about a case in the fine town of Memphis, Tex., in Hall County. I was on a trip back to the district in 1951 and was visiting with the editor of the newspaper. A fine looking Latin-American came into the newspaper plant and asked if I was the Congressman. I told him that I was. Tears came into his eyes and he said: "Mr. Congressman, you have got to do something to help me. I have three children; two of them are of school age and are healthy and strong and want to work. Not many days ago the little girl fell and broke her arm, and I had to take her to the hospital. I stayed with her until she had been properly treated. I have a little boy 10 years old who is a fine boy. He goes to school and he wants to help me, but the law says he cannot. My wife is not too strong, and both of us together cannot pull enough bolls in a day to feed our family and to pay our bills. I am an honest man and I have always paid my bills, and I want my son to be an honest man and I want him to pay his bills, and I want to teach him how to do it. If you will let my son help me and my wife, we can pick enough so that we can save and in a few weeks we can pay the doctor's bill and we can pay the drug store and we can pay the hospital bill, and that is what we want to do."

I do not need to tell you how deeply I was moved by this plea. However, I had to tell him that I did not have the authority to let his boy help him, but that I had been fighting for a correction of this law and would continue to do it. I had to tell the man that I did not have the power to help him be an honest man and to help him teach his son how to work and how to be an honest, good American citizen. I did not tell him that the Department of Labor or the Federal Government was going to keep him up nor that they were going to keep his son up. Had I done so, he would have been insulted, and he should have been. He was an honest American citizen whose hands had been tied behind him, about which I could do nothing.

Another Latin-American family who had been working for one particular farmer for years came to his farm in the fall of 1950 prepared to harvest his crop. The farmer told him that he was very sorry but that he could not employ anyone but the mother and the father. The Latin-American gentleman asked why. The farmer told him because the Government had passed a law. The Latin-American gentleman summed the situation up in one sentence. He shrugged and said, "The Government make law I can't work children; let Government make law to feed my children."

These children that I am talking about are not denied an education. They attend schools in accordance with the school attendance laws of the State of Texas, yet they are by Federal law required to run loose and are denied the right to work. Their standard of living is lowered simply because some bureaucrats are sticking their noses into businesses that they know nothing in the world about.

The bill that I introduced is in exactly the same language as the 1949 amendment, with one exception. It provides that the oppressive child-labor provision shall not apply to these children during school hours for such school district if the child has been excused by the superintendent of schools or equivalent official of either the school district where the child is employed or the school district where he has his legal residence. This simply means that the school authorities with whom we all entrust the custody of our children in both urban and rural districts have the discretionary authority to allow these children to work in harvesting the crops. It does not in any manner circumvent State attendance laws. It simply puts the problem and the responsibility back in the States and localities where it rightfully belongs. In addition, it provides a means by which the Labor Department agents could easily enforce the law. The children or their parents would have to have some evidence showing that they were not in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The officials of the Department of Labor have told me that they are afraid of my bill because of possible political influences that might be exerted in the localities. Mr. Speaker, I ask this Congress if the Department of Labor is in any position to be casting a shadow or a cloud upon any local agency about the exercise of political influence. Frankly, I would much prefer to entrust the welfare of my children to school superintendents in these various districts than to permit them to become pawns of the State at the hands of a bureaucratic, centralized agency in Washington.

Several of the farmers of my district and of Mr. MAHON's district came to Washington at their own expense and testified before the Committee on Education and Labor. They did an admirable job of presenting the entire problem and a solution. The Labor Department wanted to be heard before that committee, but to this day they have never appeared before the committee on this particular matter, or so I am informed. Recognizing the fact that the delay in getting this legislation out was becoming longer and longer, I placed on the Clerk's desk a discharge petition, petition No. 10, to bring this bill before the Congress. Needless to say, there have not been many signers on that petition. Some have the policy of not signing discharge petitions as a matter of principle, and I do not question their judgment in that respect. However, I do at this time urge you to acquaint yourself with this problem, to sign this discharge petition, and get this legislation through this Congress before the harvest season starts. Unless it is passed, you can expect to hear many, many complaints from the farmers of this country and from these migrant workers, whose economy has been upset, and everyone of those complaints will be justified.

Some people have said, "Why not close the schools during harvest season?" I am prepared to answer that. Such a philosophy would have worked 20 years ago, when school districts were small and there were many rural schools. However, in the progress and advance of education during the past 20 years the school systems have been concentrated and central educational plants have been set up and utilized. The red schoolhouse in the rural community has been closed, and in many instances torn down, and the children are being carried in school busses to small or large towns in the localities in which they live. A number of the students in these central

school plants do not work in agriculture, and I have been advised that in most instances the ratio is about 75 percent out of agriculture and 25 percent in. Now, would it make sense to close a school system and penalize 75 percent of the children in a school district who are not in agriculture and would not be employed in the harvest of the crops? Would it not be much sounder to stop this arbitrary regulatory power that has been assumed by the Department of Labor, and permit these people to conduct their own business, as they have so successfully done for many generations?

The Labor Department tells me that they want these children to go to school, and I say to the Labor Department that these children do go to school. If it is their position that these children are not going to school, why do not they advocate a Federal school attendance law, instead of trying to go through the back door and slip up on these people with a larger statute and impose upon the farmer a responsibility not his. If it is wrong for these children to work in the fields during school hours from a child-labor standpoint, then it is just as wrong for these children to work in those fields after school and on week ends. The truth is that they are not interested in whether or not agricultural work is oppressive child labor or whether or not these children get an education. This 1949 amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act is nothing in the world but a device devised by the Department of Labor to cut off a labor supply in agriculture. By doing this, they feel that it will be another step in their attempt to organize farm labor. If they are allowed to get away with it, it is not only going to upset the economy of these harvest workers, and put many of them on public charity, but it is going to break every small farmer in this country. It will also result in the greatest contribution in our age to juvenile delinquency.

The Department of Labor was not satisfied with the trick language that was placed in the 1949 amendment and that experience has taught us is definitely an unworkable monstrosity. The Department went further, and on the 13th day of March, this year, the Secretary of Labor invoked a regulation under his regulatory powers contained in the Fair Labor Standards Act. This regulation is printed in the Federal Register of Thursday, March 20, 1952, at page 2399. I want all of you to get that Register and read it. The Secretary of Labor has not only robbed the farmers of the source of labor to harvest their crops and upset the economy of the migrant harvest workers, but has now made a bookkeeper for the Government out of all farmers in this country. He has decided that the farmers must keep records, which are a complete biographical sketch of every child that works on the farm. Of course, the farmer does not have enough to do now trying to fill out forms for all the other departments of the Government, he must now set aside time to write a biography about every child that pulls a boll, cuts a head of lettuce or picks a peach on his farm. Of course, these records are much more important to human beings than the crops that could be raised by the farmer while he is sharpening his pencil and writing these biographies. The farmer by this regulation becomes a Federal employee without compensation, without social security, without pension benefits, without week ends off, and without holidays. I do not hesitate to tell you that I do not think the farmers of this country intend to take any such treatment as that.

In conclusion, I want to talk about the injustice that is being done to these children. I have seen many of them and I know many of them. I know many who have gone to school on the earnings that they have made in the cotton field, and in many instances they have saved enough money to carry them on to the higher institutions of learning. I can look out across this Chamber and see men entrusted with the affairs of this Nation who have spent many long hours in agricultural work and who learned many things in that field that have stood them well through the years. The children of today are no different from the children of yesterday, who are the leaders of today. They can learn much, as you and I did, in the fields when we were young, of God's bounties and what they mean to the human race. They can learn what it means to commune with nature, to see and appreciate God's creatures in all their glories. They can better understand the separation of the good from the bad and develop the character that is so essential to a full life.

I have complete and abiding faith in the honesty, the fairness and the decency of the American farmer, and the children of this Nation affected by this legislation will be better entrusted to the characteristics of those true Americans, than to bureaucratic control of a Washington agency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows:

Mr. JACKSON of Washington and to include an article appearing in the New Republic.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include an editorial.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARRINGTON and to include a letter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL in two instances.

Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. TABER).

Mr. BEAMER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in three instances and to include excerpts from newspapers.

Mr. GREEN and to include a commencement address by Frank C. Nash, of St. Joseph College, Philadelphia.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. FLOOD to extend his remarks at the end of title I of the bill H. R. 8210, the Defense Production Act, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a statement by Mr. Paul Kasimer before the Judiciary Committee of the House.

Mr. SIKES and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PERKINS.

Mrs. CHURCH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIEHLMAN and to include two newspaper articles.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI and to include an article.

Mr. CANFIELD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 404. An act to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 1267. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Stamey Construction Co. and/or Oklahoma Paving Co.;

H. R. 4277. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.;

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan; and

H. R. 6854. An act 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, 1953, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announces his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2198. An act to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally; and

S. 1537. An act to amend the Act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LARCADE, for an indefinite period, on account of health.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. RODINO), for Thursday, June 26, 1952, on account of death of father.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 27, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1608. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $71,750 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 521); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1609. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Iwao Inaba or Harry Owao Inaba, alias Harry I. Kida, file No. A-4892595 CR-36120, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1610. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to certain cases involving the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, requesting that they be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1611. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1612. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 8370. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON. Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8190. A bill to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River; without amendment (Rept. No. 2317). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7397. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951; with amendment (Rept. No. 2318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7876. A bill relating to the taxation of life-insurance companies; without amendment (Rept. No. 2319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2234. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and sections 118, 354, and 643 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; without amendment (Rept. No. 2320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2240. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase and fix the salary of full-time referees and to authorize increased salaries for part-time referees; without amendment (Rept. No. 2321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 2572. A bill to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries; with amendment (Rept. No. 2322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LARCADE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8321. A bill to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 8370. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 8371. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 8372. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to the State of Idaho for certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 8373. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 8374. A bill authorizing the Attorney General to enter into agreements with States holding preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, providing for the making of certain grants to such States, and the certification by the Attorney General of the names of candidates for inclusion on ballots prepared by such States for use in such elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 8375. A bill relating to the amount of gross income which a dependent of a taxpayer may have without loss by the taxpayer of an income tax exemption for such dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8376. A bill to repeal section 117 (p) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the taxability to employee of termination payments); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8377. A bill to amend section 124A of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that amortization deductions shall not be granted when to do so might tend to promote an undue concentration of economic power; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT (by request):

H. R. 8378. A bill to amend section 4 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 488. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARY:

H. Res. 710. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Annie G. Heinmiller, widow of A. W. Heinmiller, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. Res. 711. Resolution to exclude consideration of productivity as a part of wages by the Wage Stabilization Board; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 25, requesting to make available the necessary funds and take all necessary steps to prevent a decrease in the number of beds required in the area of New Orleans and vicinity to adequately treat and hospitalize sick veterans, and particularly tubercular veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 8379. A bill for the relief of Richard Brenneis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 8380. A bill for the relief of Elzbieta Grzymkowska Jarosz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 8381. A bill for the relief of Cornelio Plata Lobero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 8382. A bill for the relief of Michael David Montgomery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8383. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims in law or equity, which Maquinna Jongie Claplanhoo of Neah Bay, Wash., may have against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 8384. A bill for the relief of Faiga Kunda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8385. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stella Rebner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 8386. A bill for the relief of Lech Szczepan Korgol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8387. A bill for the relief of Agnes Alberta R. Nixon Francis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 8388. A bill for the relief of Kuniko Maemori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8389. A bill for the relief of George Reichman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

776. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of 92 residents of the city of Marion, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188 (Bryson bill); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

777. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Rev. Wesley R. Hutchings, Beaumont, Tex., and other citizens, of Beaumont, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to H. R. 2188, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and ban its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

778. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Mrs. Charles L. Childe, of Cresco, Iowa, and 13 other citizens, urging passage of H. R. 2188; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1952

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

Almighty God, before whose face the generations rise and fall, we pause with reverence and contrition, knowing that it is a good thing to give thanks unto Thee, to show forth Thy loving kindness in the morning and Thy faithfulness every night. We come asking that Thou wilt cleanse our purposes and desires, as in Thy name we face the tasks committed to our hands. We would put our hands in Thine and walk with Thee in trust and peace. When the way is uncertain, the day dreary, the problems baffling, inspire us to perform well our daily tasks, asking light for but one step at a time. Keep our lips clean and our thoughts pure. May we never doubt that at last truth and righteousness shall claim their rightful throne. May Thy kingdom come in us and through us: In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 26, 1952, 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 June 27, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 779. An act for the relief of Ziemowit Z. Karpinski;

S. 1363. An act for the relief of Ceasar J. (Raaum) Syquia;

S. 1527. An act for the relief of Sisters Dolores Illa Marteri, Maria Josefa Dalmau Vallve, and Ramona Cabarrocas Canals;

S. 1555. An act for the relief of Rosarina Garofalo;

S. 1637. An act for the relief of Doreen Iris Neal;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Else Neubert and her two children;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Sister Stanislaus;

S. 1843. An act for the relief of John Kintzig and Tatiana A. Kintzig; and

S. 2706. An act for the relief of Sister Julie Schuler.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. JACKSON of Washington, Mr. FURCOLO, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. TABER had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MAHON, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, and Mr. TABER had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6366. An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the receipt in bond and tax payment at rectifying plants of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines for rectification, bottling, and packaging, or for bottling and packaging without rectification; and the production in bond and tax payment of gin and vodka at rectifying plants; and

H. R. 8194. An act to amend an act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from 5 o'clock this afternoon until next Monday morning, in order that I may attend a Republican assembly in Massachusetts, on June 28, at which, I believe, I am to be asked to be the presiding officer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate until July 14, if the Senate does not recess or adjourn prior to that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission for the year ended December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7391. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1861).

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

S. 324. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1862);

S. 1993. A bill to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service under certain conditions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1863); and

S. 2727. A bill to amend the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195), so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force