

"yea" if present, are paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who would vote "yea" if present, are paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 23, as follows:

## YEAS—59

Alken	George	O'Connor
Baldwin	Gurney	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Saltonstall
Brooks	Jenner	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kem	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Knowland	Thye
Capehart	Langer	Tydings
Capper	Lodge	Vandenberg
Cooper	McCarthy	Watkins
Cordon	McClellan	Wherry
Donnell	McKellar	White
Dworshak	Martin	Wiley
Eastland	Maybank	Williams
Ecton	Millikin	Wilson
Ferguson	Moore	Young
Flanders	Morse	

## NAYS—23

Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Downey	Kilgore	Pepper
Ellender	Lucas	Sparkman
Fulbright	McFarland	Stewart
Green	McGrath	Taylor
Hayden	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Magnuson	Umstead
Holland	Murray	

## NOT VOTING—13

Barkley	McCarran	Russell
Butler	Malone	Tobey
Cain	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Overton	
Hatch	Robertson, Wyo.	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27), as amended, was passed, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. WILEY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. EASTLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

## EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYERS FROM LIABILITY FOR PORTAL-TO-PORTAL WAGES IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, previously I had asked that after House Joint Resolution 27 was disposed of the order of business be the portal-to-portal pay bill. Objection came from the Democratic side of the Senate. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2157, Calendar No. 44.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2157) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

## ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MYERS introduced a bill (S. 886) authorizing the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and the United States Maritime Commission to dispose of certain materials to the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] would not wish at this time to begin a discussion of the bill. I therefore move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, March 14, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 12 (legislative day of February 19), 1947:

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Garrison Norton, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

## INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Louis J. O'Marr, of Wyoming, to be Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

## UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Richard C. O'Connell, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland, vice August Klecka, deceased.

## IN THE NAVY

Admiral Jonas H. Ingram, United States Navy, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral.

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 12 (legislative day of February 19), 1947:

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Herman B. Baruch to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Netherlands.

## WITHDRAWAL

## INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Charles F. Brannan, of Colorado, to be Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

*God be merciful unto us and bless us, and cause His face to shine upon us; that Thy way may be known upon earth, Thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. O let the nations be glad and sing for joy: for Thou shalt judge the people righteously, and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase, and God, even*

*our own God, shall bless us. God shall bless us, and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him.*

Let us pray together our Lord's Prayer:

*Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.*

Amen.

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

## THE LATE MARSHALL W. PICKERING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. I announce to the House the death of Mr. Marshall W. Pickering, clerk of the majority room. The passing of this faithful public servant and true friend of mine comes as a great personal loss. I have known Marshall W. Pickering for more than half a century. He has served the Members of the House of Representatives well, faithfully, and efficiently for 38 years. To us older Members he has always been known affectionately as "Pick." Mr. Pickering was at all times charitable in his thoughts and in his actions. He always thought charitably of his friends and his neighbors. I never knew him to fail to help in a material way, as well as by kindly encouragement, unfortunate persons, whether in the time of their financial straits or in time of illness or in sorrow.

A quiet, modest, unassuming man, always making great sacrifice for others, Christmas was a holy day for Marshall Pickering. Long before Christmas he knew of many deserving and desperately poor persons who were likely to be overlooked by organized charity, and to these persons he delivered presents and good cheer.

I have known of his taking many a jobless young man and, after outfitting him with new clothes, he would then assist his friend to get a position.

Marshall Pickering has been responsible for giving many a discouraged person a new start in life. Charity, kindness, helpfulness were a part of the warp and woof of his sterling character. To know Marshall Pickering was to love and respect him. I mourn his passing as a personal loss. My sympathy and that of my family I extend to his bereaved wife and relatives.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. COFFIN].

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, as a baby Congressman, I desire to join with my colleague from New York in paying a tribute to the memory of my friend, Marshall Pickering. When I first came down here, he went very much out of his way to be helpful to me, as he did to all the other new Members, in assisting us to get our offices organized and getting ready to participate in the work of the

Eightieth Congress. In many ways he proved to be a real friend to all of us and to myself in particular.

As I think of him a quotation from Kipling's *Recessional* comes to my mind:

The tumult and the shouting dies;  
The captains and the kings depart:  
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,  
An humble and a contrite heart.

The last two lines of this quotation, in my judgment, aptly apply to Marshall Pickering. He was neither captain nor king and his name did not appear on the front pages of our newspapers in connection with the work of organizing the Eightieth Congress. Nevertheless, he was always there behind the scenes to render faithful and devoted service to all who asked his help. No one was more helpful to me and to the other new Members of this House, and there are many who bear witness to the fact that this has been an outstanding characteristic of his useful life for 38 years on Capitol Hill.

We shall miss Marshall Pickering in the days to come. I join my esteemed colleague from New York in paying a heartfelt tribute of sorrow, respect, and love to the memory of a true friend.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it was with great shock that I heard the announcement of the death of our majority clerk, Mr. Pickering. I, as one Member from New York, want to say that he was one of the finest friends I have ever known. Coming here in 1939, I had an opportunity to utilize the friendship and help and assistance which Mr. Pickering extended to all new Members. I feel this loss deeply, because I know we are all bereft of a great friend. I know the entire Republican majority, as well as the rest, feel likewise, especially those Members who have been here several years. I really got to know Mr. Pickering intimately.

His passing reminds me of the sentence Mark Antony said in Julius Caesar:

His life was gentle, and the elements  
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up  
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the New England Milk Producers Association on sugar and a bill he recently introduced on sugar.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article by Lowell Mellett.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with regard to a bill he introduced today.

#### ALASKA, HAWAII, AND PUERTO RICO

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president emeritus of Columbia University.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a matter which I think is of sufficient importance to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House, even though at the moment it may be premature. It has to do with the proposal to admit the Hawaiian Islands as a State in our Union.

I received this morning a letter from Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president emeritus of Columbia University, one of our very great distinguished citizens, expressing the most emphatic objection and dissent. He expresses his views with his usual force and clarity. I think the subject is of great significance worthy of the most careful attention in Congress and out.

I hope my colleagues will take advantage of the opportunity to read his views as expressed in his letter, which will appear in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

MARCH 7, 1947.

Hon. JULIUS A. KRUG,  
*Secretary of the Interior,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I call to your attention a matter which I regard of extreme importance to the Government and people of the United States. Under no circumstances should Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or any other outlying island or territory be admitted as a State in our Federal Union. To do so, in my judgment, would mark the beginning of the end of the United States as we have known it and as it has become so familiar and so useful to the world. Our country now consists of a sound and compact area, bounded by Canada, by Mexico, and by the two oceans. To add outlying territory hundreds or thousands of miles away, with what certainly must be different interests from ours and very different background, might easily mark, as I said, the beginning of the end.

Think of what would happen were the vote of one Senator from Alaska or Hawaii or Puerto Rico to defeat the ratification of an important treaty affecting the policy and good order of the world. It is unthinkable that we should allow any such possibility.

On the other hand, I suggest that each one of these Territories—Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico—be set up, by treaty, as an independent and self-governing nation, subject to but two limitations. These are, first, that their relations with foreign powers should be subject to the approval of the President of the United States and the United States Senate. This would prevent any foreign power from using them to our disadvantage. The second is that litigants in any one of these countries should have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. The effect of this would be to establish a uniform system of public and civil law in this part of the world. This privilege now exists in the case of Puerto Rico and I am told works extremely well.

I earnestly ask your most serious consideration of this proposal and the avoidance of the damage that would be done to our Government and our people by extending

the United States beyond its present very compact and naturally defined boundaries. I regret that on account of my total blindness, I cannot sign this letter myself.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a Gold Star Mother.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a letter.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the completion of business on the Speaker's desk and on the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes today.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include the minority report on S. 110.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. FOLGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Mason J. Dixon on the subject of the FEPC.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### THE QUESTION OF STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] concerning the matter of statehood for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, I wish to point out that in 1944 one of the national platforms, if not both of them, included a recommendation that Hawaii, at least, be made a State of the Union. Without taking any position on the matter at all at this moment, I do want to say I think it goes to the fundamentals, and the question we have to answer is whether we are going to begin making States out of possessions that are not contiguous to the United

States of America. I think it is a deep fundamental question that we will have to meet one day, and we had better put our best thinking on it.

The **SPEAKER**. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has expired.

#### RECESS

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Speaker.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

#### JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the President pro tempore of the Senate and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The **SPEAKER**. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints the following members of the committee to conduct the President of the United States into the Chamber: The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore of the Senate. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

At 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 1 o'clock p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The **SPEAKER**. Members of the Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

**ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—GREECE, TURKEY, AND THE MIDDLE EAST (H. DOC. NO. 171)**

The **PRESIDENT**. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress of the United States, the gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.

The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

One aspect of the present situation, which I wish to present to you at this time for your consideration and decision, concerns Greece and Turkey.

The United States has received from the Greek Government an urgent appeal for financial and economic assistance. Preliminary reports from the American economic mission now in Greece and reports from the American Ambassador in Greece corroborate the statement of the Greek Government that assistance is imperative if Greece is to survive as a free nation.

I do not believe that the American people and the Congress wish to turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Greek Government.

Greece is not a rich country. Lack of sufficient natural resources has always forced the Greek people to work hard to make both ends meet. Since 1940, this industrious and peace-loving country has suffered invasion, 4 years of cruel enemy occupation, and bitter internal strife.

When forces of liberation entered Greece they found that the retreating Germans had destroyed virtually all the railways, roads, port facilities, communications, and merchant marine. More than a thousand villages had been burned. Eighty-five percent of the children were tubercular. Livestock, poultry, and draft animals had almost disappeared. Inflation had wiped out practically all savings.

As a result of these tragic conditions, a militant minority, exploiting human want and misery, was able to create political chaos which, until now, has made economic recovery impossible.

Greece is today without funds to finance the importation of those goods which are essential to bare subsistence. Under these circumstances the people of Greece cannot make progress in solving their problems of reconstruction. Greece is in desperate need of financial and economic assistance to enable it to resume purchases of food, clothing, fuel, and seeds. These are indispensable for the subsistence of its people and are obtainable only from abroad. Greece must have help to import the goods necessary to restore internal order and security so essential for economic and political recovery.

The Greek Government has also asked for the assistance of experienced American administrators, economists, and technicians to insure that the financial and other aid given to Greece shall be used effectively in creating a stable and self-sustaining economy and in improving its public administration.

The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists, who defy the Government's authority at a number of points, particularly along the northern boundaries. A commission appointed by the United Nations Security Council is at present investigating disturbed conditions in northern Greece and alleged border violations along the frontier between Greece on the one hand and

Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia on the other.

Meanwhile, the Greek Government is unable to cope with the situation. The Greek Army is small and poorly equipped. It needs supplies and equipment if it is to restore the authority of the Government throughout Greek territory.

Greece must have assistance if it is to become a self-supporting and self-respecting democracy.

The United States must supply this assistance. We have already extended to Greece certain types of relief and economic aid but these are inadequate.

There is no other country to which democratic Greece can turn.

No other nation is willing and able to provide the necessary support for a democratic Greek Government.

The British Government, which has been helping Greece, can give no further financial or economic aid after March 31. Great Britain finds itself under the necessity of reducing or liquidating its commitments in several parts of the world, including Greece.

We have considered how the United Nations might assist in this crisis. But the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action, and the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required.

It is important to note that the Greek Government has asked for our aid in utilizing effectively the financial and other assistance we may give to Greece, and in improving its public administration. It is of the utmost importance that we supervise the use of any funds made available to Greece [applause], in such a manner that each dollar spent will count toward making Greece self-supporting, and will help to build an economy in which a healthy democracy can flourish.

No government is perfect. One of the chief virtues of a democracy, however, is that its defects are always visible and under democratic processes can be pointed out and corrected. The Government of Greece is not perfect. Nevertheless it represents 85 percent of the members of the Greek Parliament who were chosen in an election last year. Foreign observers, including 692 Americans, considered this election to be a fair expression of the views of the Greek people.

The Greek Government has been operating in an atmosphere of chaos and extremism. It has made mistakes. The extension of aid by this country does not mean that the United States condones everything that the Greek Government has done or will do. We have condemned in the past, and we condemn now, extremist measures of the right or the left. We have in the past advised tolerance, and we advise tolerance now.

Greece's neighbor, Turkey, also deserves our attention.

The future of Turkey as an independent and economically sound state is clearly no less important to the freedom-loving peoples of the world than the future of Greece. The circumstances in which Turkey finds itself today are considerably different from those of Greece. Turkey has been spared the disasters that have beset Greece. And during the

war, the United States and Great Britain furnished Turkey with material aid.

Nevertheless, Turkey now needs our support.

Since the war, Turkey has sought financial assistance from Great Britain and the United States for the purpose of effecting that modernization necessary for the maintenance of its national integrity.

That integrity is essential to the preservation of order in the Middle East.

The British Government has informed us that, owing to its own difficulties, it can no longer extend financial or economic aid to Turkey.

As in the case of Greece, if Turkey is to have the assistance it needs, the United States must supply it. We are the only country able to provide that help.

I am fully aware of the broad implications involved if the United States extends assistance to Greece and Turkey, and I shall discuss these implications with you at this time.

One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. This was a fundamental issue in the war with Germany and Japan. Our victory was won over countries which sought to impose their will, and their way of life, upon other nations.

To insure the peaceful development of nations, free from coercion, the United States has taken a leading part in establishing the United Nations. The United Nations is designed to make possible lasting freedom and independence for all its members. We shall not realize our objectives, however, unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes. [Applause.] This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States.

The peoples of a number of countries of the world have recently had totalitarian regimes forced upon them against their will. The Government of the United States has made frequent protests against coercion and intimidation, in violation of the Yalta agreement, in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. I must also state that in a number of other countries there have been similar developments.

At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one.

One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.

The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and

radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

I believe that our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid, which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes.

The world is not static and the status quo is not sacred. But we cannot allow changes in the status quo in violation of the Charter of the United Nations by such methods as coercion, or by such subterfuges as political infiltration. In helping free and independent nations to maintain their freedom, the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

It is necessary only to glance at a map to realize that the survival and integrity of the Greek nation are of grave importance in a much wider situation. If Greece should fall under the control of an armed minority, the effect upon its neighbor, Turkey, would be immediate and serious. Confusion and disorder might well spread throughout the entire Middle East.

Moreover, the disappearance of Greece as an independent state would have a profound effect upon those countries in Europe whose peoples are struggling against great difficulties to maintain their freedoms and their independence while they repair the damages of war.

It would be an unspeakable tragedy if these countries, which have struggled so long against overwhelming odds, should lose that victory for which they sacrificed so much. Collapse of free institutions and loss of independence would be disastrous not only for them but for the world. Discouragement and possibly failure would quickly be the lot of neighboring peoples striving to maintain their freedom and independence.

Should we fail to aid Greece and Turkey in this fateful hour, the effect will be far reaching to the West as well as to the East.

We must take immediate and resolute action.

I therefore ask the Congress to provide authority for assistance to Greece and Turkey in the amount of \$400,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1948. In requesting these funds, I have taken into consideration the maximum amount of relief assistance which would be furnished to Greece out of the \$350,000,000 which I recently requested that the Congress authorize for the prevention of starvation and suffering in countries devastated by the war.

In addition to funds, I ask the Congress to authorize the detail of American civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey, at the request of those countries, to assist in the tasks of reconstruction, and for the purpose of supervising the use of such financial and material assistance as may be furnished. I recommend that authority also be provided for the instruction and training of selected Greek and Turkish personnel.

Finally, I ask that the Congress provide authority which will permit the speediest and most effective use, in terms of needed commodities, supplies, and equipment, of such funds as may be authorized.

If further funds, or further authority, should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before the Congress. On this subject the executive and legislative branches of the Government must work together.

This is a serious course upon which we embark.

I would not recommend it except that the alternative is much more serious. [Applause.]

The United States contributed \$341,000,000,000 toward winning World War II. This is an investment in world freedom and world peace.

The assistance that I am recommending for Greece and Turkey amounts to little more than one-tenth of 1 percent of this investment. It is only common sense that we should safeguard this investment and make sure that it was not in vain.

The seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife. They reach their full growth when the hope of a people for a better life has died.

We must keep that hope alive.

The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms.

If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world—and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our own Nation.

Great responsibilities have been placed upon us by the swift movement of events.

I am confident that the Congress will face these responsibilities squarely. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m., the President retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the object of the joint session having been completed, the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon, the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 1:35.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 1:35 p. m.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m. by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The message of the President is referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

#### RE-REFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2184) to amend section 304 of the

act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, and the bill (H. R. 2190) to provide that schools constructed under the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, may be donated to local school agencies; and that the same be re-referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott]?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Capt. Robert Montgomery at a dinner last night.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on world relief and to include an article on the same subject.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by James Reston appearing in the New York Times today.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands may be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

#### IMPORT TAX ON COPPER

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 140, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would make in order the immediate consideration of H. R. 2404, a bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper. The enactment of this bill would make it possible for American copper users to buy

their supplies in foreign markets without paying a price far above that paid by other countries. At present there is no economic reason for this tariff. Domestic producers of copper realize that they cannot produce enough to meet even domestic demand, and they do not oppose this bill. For many years, this country produced enough copper to meet domestic demand, and was a large exporter of the commodity. At that time a tariff was feasible to protect domestic producers, and Congress levied a tax on foreign imports of copper amounting to \$80 a ton. But now the situation has changed altogether. Domestic producers can supply only 75,000 short tons of copper a month, while domestic consumption is about 140,000 short tons. To fill this gap, the Metals Reserve Company has supplied 50,000 to 60,000 tons a month. But Government stock piles of copper will probably be exhausted within a month. Unless some remedy for this situation is forthcoming, industrial users of copper will be forced to curtail their operations, and the result will be widespread unemployment in the copper-fabricating industry and other industries depending for supplies upon copper manufacturers. It is the purpose of this bill to remove for 3 years the tariff barrier to the importation of copper.

H. R. 2404 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, and this resolution was reported unanimously by the Rules Committee. It is a completely nonpartisan measure, and little controversy is likely to develop in debate on the bill. Therefore, the Committee on Rules has provided but 1 hour of general debate. Amendments under the 5-minute rule and one motion to recommit have been provided should an objection arise to any portion of the bill. This resolution embodies a general rule, simply providing for the consideration of this important bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I have no comment on the bill itself; I think it is a good idea, but I do ask the Rules Committee if the length of time was discussed. It seems to me important, in view of the uncertain world conditions, that the period should be shorter than that mentioned in the bill.

Mr. HERTER. I may say to the gentleman from California that the Rules Committee is not empowered to amend legislation that comes before it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Then I shall reserve my question until the bill is taken up for consideration.

Mr. HERTER. It is my understanding that an amendment along that very line will be offered from the floor.

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

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

#### RULE AND BILL SHOULD PASS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts has thoroughly explained the rule and also the bill.

The Ways and Means Committee, after having heard many witnesses, reported

this bill and requested a rule which was unanimously granted. This relief is needed immediately because manufacturers who use copper and metals alloyed with copper need it to get additional copper to permit them to continue in the production of many necessities that are in great demand.

We are, of course, a rich nation. We grow and produce more than any other nation in the world; nevertheless we cannot produce everything and our needs require that from time to time we obtain raw materials from other countries; consequently, the Democratic Party for many years has believed we should bear that in mind and not close our doors or preclude the importation of needed raw materials to permit us to continue to be the greatest manufacturing and producing nation. Our friends on the left have charged us with being free traders, which, of course, was not correct or justified. We have always been for tariffs, but for revenue only.

#### SMOOT-HAWLEY TARIFF PRECIPITATED WORLD DEPRESSION

The Republicans honestly believed, I suppose, that when they passed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, they were acting to safeguard American industry and American workers from foreign competition. We know now that the Smoot-Hawley tariff, with its unscalable economic walls and its interference with private enterprise, helped to precipitate world-wide depression and stagnation and to create the conditions in which Nazi-fascism and other totalitarian systems were able to impose their tyrannies and to threaten the whole world with slavery or destruction.

Even Republicans, or most of them, know now that trade is a two-way street. We cannot always sell and never buy. Not only did we restrict world trade with that act, and sow the seeds of world war, but we injured our own foreign commerce and exhausted or deeply depleted our own precious reserves of minerals and natural resources.

#### RECIPROCAL TRADE TREATIES ARE REMEDY

By this time, I take it, my Republican friends, except for a few die-hards who would like to build a Chinese wall around our borders and cut off all intercourse with the rest of humanity, will agree now that the reciprocal trade treaties, so wisely devised by the late President Roosevelt and his great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, are the proper instruments for our foreign trade, so that we can exchange our surplus crops or our manufactured goods for raw materials that we need and do not have.

As I have said, we are the greatest manufacturing country in the world and for years we have been the greatest agricultural country in the world.

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

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry; I cannot yield now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wanted to say something else we were great in.

Mr. SABATH. I know the gentleman wants to say something else, but I do not think he can enlighten me on this.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to agree with the gentleman. Can he not let me make a contributing observation?

Mr. SABATH. I am indeed gratified and immensely pleased that the gentleman from Michigan will agree with me and does agree with me at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not want to accept it before I say it, does he?

Mr. SABATH. I hope the gentleman will agree with me many times from now on because I always try to be right and bring light and information not only to the gentleman but to the membership of the House and to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to detain the House longer because this bill deserves immediate consideration and should be passed without delay. I am indeed gratified that the majority has seen fit to realize and understand that the position of the Democrats has been always right, and in the best interests of the Nation, and we owe our pre-eminence in world industry, and our capacity to become the arsenal of democracy, and the granary of democracy, during the war, to the wise and prudent policies of the Democratic administrations.

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

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] seemed so enraptured with his own words and his own thoughts so intent that he would not yield. He spoke about this being a great nation and the many things in which it has been first for so many years. I want to agree with him on that. It is the most powerful nation. But it is also the nation that can get into more wars, fight more wars for other people than any other nation in all the world. The thing that the President today did not tell us was how much of an effort we are going to make, how many dollars are involved, how many tons of munitions and supplies for war will be needed, how many men we are going to send into World War III. If he will tell us more about those matters I am sure those who will be the veterans and veterans' dependents of World War III will be much interested.

Mr. SABATH. I am not speaking for the President.

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

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason in the world why this rule should not be adopted and, as far as that is concerned, adopted with a minimum of discussion. However, it is always proper to explain just what the rule does and what the bill provides when it comes up for consideration.

This bill provides for the elimination of the import tax on copper up to March 31, 1950. The tax now being 4 cents per pound. The idea being to relieve the shortage of copper in this country.

The Ways and Means Committee has reported this bill unanimously. There is no opposition apparently from either side of the House.

The rule provides for immediate consideration of this copper bill. The bill recognizes the fact that today in this country there is a great shortage of raw copper and it provides, as I have said, for the importation of copper into the country free of any duty. The duty is to be taken off for a certain period of time. That time limitation is March 31, 1950.

Those of you who are protectionists may rest assured that we have followed this through very carefully, with the idea of not doing violence to the traditional protection policies of the Republican Party. The testimony was overwhelming that this commodity is sadly needed in the country. The testimony comes from practically all producers of copper and copper goods, from the biggest and most important industries down to the smallest industry engaged in the manufacture of copper and copper products. For this reason I expect to support the rule and the bill. As soon as domestic production approaches the domestic demand we can then restore the duty.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does this bill take all tariffs off of copper?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It takes off of raw copper all of this import tax but not off of commodities made of copper.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand it takes the import tax off.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I was wondering if it takes all of the tariffs off of raw copper?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; every tax and duty comes off the raw copper. I mean by that, that we will not change the duty on articles made of copper. Those foreign-made commodities already manufactured will bear the regular duty.

Mr. RANKIN. I notice the time is limited to 1950.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I am wondering whether it would not be best just to strike out in line 7, all after the word "act" for this reason. Now, you are going to start your manufacturing in this country, and it is going to take them some time to get geared up to manufacture things made of copper, and leaving this deadline of 1950 in there may have a deterrent effect on them. We need many things now, especially transformers, in which copper is used in the manufacture. What I am afraid of is that if you leave that deadline in there, you are deterring the manufacturers in this country from going into the business.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. We could not agree to that change. That proposition was discussed very considerably in the committee, and there was no sentiment of any consequence to that effect. The purpose of this legislation is to meet a serious scarcity of a very necessary commodity. As soon as that serious scarcity has been relieved Congress can, and no doubt will, restore that duty. The gentleman will, as this debate continues, find that the Congressmen from New Mexico and Arizona and Montana, all of

whom are Democrats and free traders, generally will be ardent in their demand for the maintenance of a protective tariff on copper.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that a different date was submitted, but this was the farthest-off date that was suggested. Some wanted 1 and 2 years, but 3 was the limit which was proposed by any witness before the committee.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. This was the date finally agreed upon unanimously.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. That rather answers the question in my mind. As I understand it, there was no inclination in the minds of the committee to effect a permanent repeal, but it was to be rather in the nature of a temporary suspension, the only question being the length of time that the suspension would be effective. After the termination of the time of the suspension, of course, the committee and the Congress can take a look at the existing situation and determine what properly ought to be done.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No doubt they will, because the small producers of copper in the country will be able to function, and by that time we hope the industry will have stabilized itself, and if they need protection, we will have to give it to them. There is no intention to place any additional burden on the small producers. I am as jealous for the best welfare of the small producers as any Member. In fact, I would not support this measure if I thought it would be to the disadvantage of the small producers.

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

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. A date beyond 1950 might be too far, and we would be confronted then with complaints from many of the small producers of the country, and they would complain justly, and the purpose of the committee was to extend the date as far as practicable in accordance with the testimony of the experts that we had before us.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman mentioned a bit ago our hope that in due course, perhaps 2, 3, or 4 years, the domestic producers of copper may again need protection from foreign competition. It is interesting to note that the State Department is presently including, in connection with new reciprocal trade agreements—copper. The rate thus can be reduced on these agreements on a long-term basis, to the permanent injury of our domestic industry. We believe this protection should be continued as it is today, subject only to a

temporary suspension which this bill now provides.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I wish to reiterate my statement that there was no tendency anywhere to put any undue burden on the small producers of copper. On the contrary this date was fixed as the maximum date so that we felt sure that it would do the job intended and at the same time would not encroach upon the rights and privileges of the small producers of copper in the country.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the message we heard today delivered by President Truman was not only a courageous message but a historic message. It was a message that will reverberate throughout the world.

I have repeatedly said on the floor of the House, and publicly, that all the countries of the world are either looking to the Kremlin or to the White House, to Moscow or Washington. I have stated that the peoples of most countries look toward Washington. If we fail them, of necessity, they are compelled to bend, through fear, to the influence of the Soviet Union.

Last July on the floor of the House I made a speech exposing the conditions that existed in Yugoslavia under the heartless and cruel dictator, Tito. At that time I had reliable information upon which I based the main premises of my speech. On January 23 the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made a dramatic speech on the floor of this House and, being so impressed, and having some strong views of my own, I followed him. His was a powerful and able speech, and his main premise was that freedom is the great issue. On that occasion, supplementing what he said, I said, and I quote from the RECORD of January 23:

The gentleman said "freedom" is the great issue. He is absolutely correct. He said that "Red fascism" or "atheistic communism" is on the march. I have said that before. We might just as well face the facts. On July 27, 1946, in a speech on this floor, I exposed conditions existing in Yugoslavia under Tito. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in my opinion, is absolutely correct in the issue involved in its broad aspect. We are confronted in the world of today with a clash of two concepts of life, one the Marxist concept, the state, all powerful, the state supreme, with its viciousness; and on the other hand, the western concept, the concept of those who believe in one God; Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, the Christian concept of life. There is a clash today, and we must face the situation and face the real conditions in a realistic manner. In doing this, there is no middle aisle dividing us. There are no Republicans and no Democrats on that issue. We are all concerned with the national interest of our country. We find the boring in; we find coalition governments; we find the taking over; we find the suppression of labor; we find the constant encroachment; we find the inability to have agreements made on fundamentals; the representatives of our country and other countries willing to do so, but always uncertainty, confusion, and chaos existing due to the practices and actions of the Soviet Union. We find the Balkan nations behind the iron curtain, except little Greece, and that country is besieged. We see conditions existing in China. All of these things should bring to our conscious mind, those of us who

believe in the concept of life that we do, that our way of life is being challenged.

I said it then, and I believe it now. I base my position upon the national interest of the United States of America. I say that it is not for the national interest of our country to see Greece denied assistance by the United States; to see Greece through our failure, through our default, subjected to those pressures which we know exist on the part of a minority, and which under certain conditions could take control of the country and the people. When such a minority takes control of a government, and with the power of government imposes its will upon the people of a country, despite the fact that the great majority of the people of that country are not in agreement with the dictatorial, totalitarian oligarchy that has wrested the powers of their government unlawfully from the people, I say it is not for the national interest of the United States.

My sentiment for Greece is great, but I am concerned with the national interest of my country. I say it is not for the national interest of my country to see Turkey, as well as Greece, become subject to the influence of that same orbit, the Soviet orbit. I say it is not in the interest of my country, the United States of America, to see Italy, or France, or Spain, go under the control of the Communists. I say it is not in the national interest of my country to see China subject to the influence of the Soviet orbit.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. At the outset of the gentleman's remarks he said the world now looks to the Kremlin or the White House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I used the expression in a descriptive sense.

Mr. VORYS. May I suggest, and I know the gentleman will agree with me, that that was merely a passing reference. If we want to face our responsibility fully on the floor of this House, we would say, and the gentleman would say, that the world looks to the Kremlin or the Capitol of the United States where the President has just given a message to the Congress and where the gentlemen and others are speaking of responsibilities that are not merely the responsibility of the White House but the responsibility of the peoples' representatives here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. VORYS. It would seem to me well to call attention to the fact that the world is looking at the Capitol of the United States and is listening to this debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has interpreted my remarks correctly, and I am glad that he has made the observation because later in my talk I said "Moscow or Washington." I accept the suggestion to say that the world is looking to the Kremlin or to the Capitol of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman. Many times we have been together on this question on the infiltra-

tion of communism into this country. But this unfortunately is one of the questions on which we differ. During this last year we were arming Tito, and now we are beginning apparently to pay for it with blood of our boys. That is where the biggest part of the war material went that we sent over.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is raising another question which I shall not go into at present, but I would condemn that as much as anyone else if that were a fact.

Mr. REED of New York. It is a fact.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not challenging the statement of my friend because I am satisfied that Tito was using our assistance to further his own purposes. So, you see, I am not challenging the statement of the gentleman, but to what extent it was used is another question.

I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts on the splendid statement that he is making. If we fail to assist Greece and Turkey, as the President has suggested this morning, will not the Mediterranean become a Soviet lake, and will not the security of the United States then be imperiled, and will not the leadership of the United States of America be placed in jeopardy?

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to that, in my opinion, is simply yes, and I will give my reasons. It is my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, the nation that controls the Mediterranean controls Europe, and the nation that controls Europe controls Asia and Africa. I believe I have given the gentleman the reason for my answer.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. I rise to join my voice with others in paying tribute to the distinguished former majority leader for the statement that he is making today, and especially because of the fact that he has been willing to make forthright statements on this issue in days when it was not popular in many quarters to make it.

Does not the gentleman feel also that as we stand today at this crossroad we should add to our sense of grave responsibility a sense of regret that in some degree we have been assisting a Communist minority in China in its efforts to overthrow the Chinese Government, which with all its weaknesses has steadfastly refused to yield to such internal and external pressures as today threaten Greece and Turkey? Whatever our intentions were, has not our policy resulted in weakening our ally, the Government of China, and strengthening the Communist minority? Will the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. McCORMACK. In answer to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, I would observe that prior to last Monday I probably felt the same way as the gentleman did, but as a result of information, I can assure the gentleman there is no assistance being given to the Communists in China. I believe that when there is a more representative gov-

ernment established there, that affirmative action along the lines that the gentleman and I would agree should be extended over there.

Mr. JUDD. I want to make quite clear I was not suggesting that the United States has been giving direct assistance to the Communists of China; but the inevitable, inescapable result of our policy of trying to bring the minority Communists into the Chinese Government and failing to support effectively that government while helping to correct its weaknesses has been to strengthen the Communists' position.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without doing anything—failure to do things helped them. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman and I are in complete agreement.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COX. In view of the gentleman's statement, I have no desire to ask for recognition, but I purposed, however, to ask that the gentleman permit me to rephrase the question of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] to say that might we not, with some sense of regret, look upon the fact that we probably have not rendered assistance to Chiang Kai-shek that was due him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot challenge that. I am not going to challenge it, but as a result of this message today, if the Congress supports the message, the issue is joined. I have always taken the position that our form of government is a dynamic, forward-looking form of government. There is nothing negative about democratic institutions of government. We have to act and think affirmatively. We have to be forward-looking in order to have a democracy serve a people. The totalitarian form is a destructive form of government. It is negative government. The issue is joined today by this message. No matter where it may lead us, the issue is joined. And I am glad the issue is joined, not because it happened to be President Truman. Entertaining the views that I do, if any other President had read that message I would have had a feeling of satisfaction as an American that the issue is joined throughout the world, and that the nations and peoples of the world know that the great United States is going to use its power for good, if the Congress will support the President, and its power to preserve the 2,000-year way of life that we are the inheritors of, and which we want to pass on to future generations of Americans and future generations elsewhere who believe in the concept of life that we do.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Just what does the gentleman mean when he says the issues are joined? It would seem to me the implications in the gentleman's statement would amount to a declaration of war.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. The gentleman knows that is not so. There is always a certain calculated risk in everything we do. The question is, "Which is the greater calculated risk,

whether we are going to do nothing or whether we are going, through the measures recommended by the President, to take steps in accordance with his recommendations?" I will concede there is a certain calculated risk, but I say if we do nothing, and if we let Greece go and if we let Turkey go, that will be two. Then, in my opinion, it will be Italy and it will be France and it will be Spain and it will be all of Europe. I say that this calculated risk is far greater and more dangerous to the national interest of our country than the calculated risk recommended to us by the President of the United States.

Mr. JUDD. Is not this an accurate statement: we in the United States are not now joining the issues, we are merely belatedly recognizing that they have long been joined, not by our choice but by the choice of others. We are not rising to attack the way of life of others; we are rising to defend the general way of life in which we believe against attacks from others. We have not raised the issues; but we cannot longer blind ourselves to the fact that they have been raised and we cannot escape them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I say just a word about this bill that is before us at this time. The miners of my State of Colorado are rather worried about this reduction in the tariff on copper. We have many mines in my State which are small mines, marginal mines, and which produce copper, lead, zinc, and other raw material. Therefore, in order to protect those men and in order that we may be sure that we may have an adequate supply, I am going to offer an amendment at the proper time, which will read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "1950" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "1949."

In other words, in 2 years we will know whether there actually is a short supply and, thereby, give the marginal copper producers an opportunity to have this tariff put back on if it becomes necessary.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I do not hope to do much toward blocking the passage of this rule. I regret that the rule is brought before us today or that the bill which it makes in order is brought before us today, for I think this bill might have been so written as to pass under unanimous consent.

As I said to the Committee on Ways and Means when this bill was being considered in the committee, the mining people recognize that there is a shortage of copper in this country, a serious shortage; in fact, there is a world shortage. These mining people, the producers of copper, want to meet the manufacturers, the fabricators, and other consumers of copper part way in some trial period of suspending the duty. I believe if the committee had brought this in

with a mere suspension of the 4-cent excise duty for 1 year, it could have been passed by unanimous consent. The bill however does not reach us in that form. The rule therefore is before us.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. There was not a single witness who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee who testified in his opinion that our domestic supply of copper would equal our domestic requirements in a year; and I am asking the gentleman from Arizona now if he believes there is any chance that domestic production within a year can meet domestic consumption?

Mr. MURDOCK. The same question was asked by the gentleman in the committee. I believe that within 12 months we will go far towards reaching the increased domestic production needed and will also be then better able to know what further needs to be done.

We do not dare assume too great a risk. I heard solemn tones here today as I listened to the Chief Executive from that desk and from our leaders on both sides of the aisle. This is no time, Mr. Speaker, to throw down the safeguards of domestic production of that most vitally necessary red metal which we need in national defense as this 3-year suspension would throw them down.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURDOCK. Pardon me, I cannot yield now.

We are not in a position today to guard ourselves with this necessary military requirement. At this very moment our production of basic copper is less than it was in 1939 and 1941, although we have passed stock piling legislation; we have made arrangements for accumulations for national defense of strategic and critical minerals and metals but we have not accumulated the copper.

Oh, you say, let us suspend or even repeal the 4-cent duty now existing and get this copper in. But this legislation is not necessary for that. We can import all the foreign copper we please or need duty-free as a matter of national defense. We did it during the war, we can do it now if national defense demands it.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am informed by experts in the copper production field that the industry can stand a short suspension, say 1 year, and they are willing to do it in order that consumers may have this much needed product to meet the postwar demand. There is a great accumulation of demand for copper that creates this temporary shortage. I am not able to say when that shortage will be met by domestic production but I do say that if we suspend for only 1 year and at the end of the year's time we find there still remains a shortage, we can then continue the suspension.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. With reference to the question raised by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT],

may I say that Mr. Hayes, Director of Metals and Minerals, Civilian Production Administration, appeared before the committee on the same day that we were there. He stated:

I do not believe that it is wise to suspend that duty for too long a time. In my opinion, a suspension of the 4-cent duty until June 30, 1948, would be sufficient at the present time; then in the spring of 1948 you take another look at the picture.

I do not agree with him exactly, but at least that statement was made in the record that day.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; and he was one of the finest and most expert witnesses who appeared before the committee at that time. That was his statement. I hope the committee will heed his advice.

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

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have listened today to what is perhaps one of the most historic messages ever given to this Congress. It makes very clear, as I interpret it, that we have two possible paths to follow. One might well mean guns, and the other might well mean a far more subtle method, one that requires a background of knowledge coupled with great wisdom. Without question this last would have the greater appeal for the people of this country.

We were told unequivocally that totalitarian expansion must be stopped. The method was very definitely laid upon us to work out. This novel procedure gives a clear indication that a new era is at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I am a woman, and, as a woman, I cannot agree that war measures—troops, equipment, and all that that means—are necessarily the only answer. I believe that the people of this country expect the Congress to do everything it is humanly possible to do to find a peaceful way. Do not misunderstand me; the peaceful way is not one of appeasement, rather it is one of clear, definite, positive action. This is no moment for weakness and negativeness, which are tools of the timid and the fearful. Nor is it Greece and Turkey alone that are involved in possible destruction. This is a moment when everything that man has built is in danger of tumbling around his ears. Wisdom and strength must be our tools as never before in the whole history of mankind.

So I contend that guns are not the only possible way to resolve the world problem of starvation, bound up as it is in the President's newly stated policy that totalitarian aggression must be stopped. You cannot eat guns, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Greece and other lands are starving. It would seem unthinkable not to feed the starving, but our people have the right to expect us to make every penny we put into food and other supplies do an honest job. They have the right to expect us to find ways to make every dollar count for ultimate freedom.

Just as we must be careful in our use of words so must we guard against carelessness in our actions. Let us also bear in mind that totalitarian aggression,

while it is expressed in many ways, achieves its maximum results through poverty and hunger. To combat it we must put at least some food into empty stomachs and make it possible for these countries to reach out towards economic stability. Charity alone will not do the job. Loans will of necessity follow so that trade may once again flow. Such loans must be supervised by American experts in finance, industry, agriculture, and other fields so that they may be made to yield maximum results. Any other course will not only not benefit our friends but will wreck our own economy.

As a woman I dare risk a moment of prophecy, feeling as I do that our whole civilization is at stake. Is it not conceivable that we shall have to review our own method of economy particularly where it touches the other countries of the world?

To this end, Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that this Congress will deal with these tremendous responsibilities with a sense of consecration on a basis of thorough knowledge of the over-all picture, not in piecemeal bits.

So I urge upon you, as I demand of myself, the need for knowledge for understanding and for strength that we, as a nation, may justify the faith of those who look to us.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a very interesting address by the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. We have heard a great deal today about the national emergency and the international situation, and yet here with a mere brush of the shoulder, we are about to vote on legislation which is possibly going to destroy or seriously cripple one of our most important industries, the copper-mining industry. I want to remind you that this piece of legislation is being considered without giving due consideration to the industry concerned to be heard. This piece of legislation was jerked out of thin air and was voted out of committee without the copper-mining industry of this country being given notice. If you take the tariff off the copper-mining industry in this country for a period of 3 years, your development work in the copper mines will stop. I worked in a copper mine for 5 years, and I know what I am talking about. A company will not spend \$50,000,000 or even \$100,000 without getting a fair return. Incidentally, \$50,000,000 was the amount spent in one mine, the Morenci mine, before the producer took out one cent of profit. No company nor individual will extend himself unless he is guaranteed a fair return on his investment. Now, we are facing a grave world situation. The copper-mining industry suffered throughout this last war because the OPA froze the price of copper at 12 cents a pound. Now that the ceiling has been taken off, the industry is beginning to strive again. We cannot depend upon a source of copper from the South American countries or Africa to support our national defense and to protect us in time of an emergency.

I was very much surprised to see that this bill was reported out in its present

form to extend the moratorium until 1950. I have no doubt but what this rule will pass, but there will be some amendments offered, and I say that 2 years or until 1949, is too long under present conditions, because if you want a healthy mining industry you cannot count on a shortage to last for more than 1 year. That was testified to by Mr. Hayes, the only real authority that testified before the committee. As a matter of fact, the Congressman from the different copper-mining States concerned in this matter were not really notified. We heard about it indirectly and went to the committee and appeared. We were given the courtesy of making a statement.

We contend that the moratorium should not extend beyond June 30, 1948. If the shortage continues when that time arrives, then we can reconsider the matter and provide for an additional extension.

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

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand there are 9 minutes remaining on our side to be allotted. I shall not object to this request, but there are two or three other matters we hope to dispose of this afternoon and I shall, except for this subsequent allotment of time, feel constrained to object to requests to proceed out of order until the business scheduled for consideration in the House has been disposed of.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I stated in the well of the House:

The major European problems which afflict us today are the direct products of the secret agreements secretly arrived at during the war. For reasons unknown to the American people and even to those in the State Department who should have known, European spheres of influence were carved out at the major conferences of Russia, Great Britain, and our country. Russia was given control over the whole of central and western Europe. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and the Balkans were read out of western Europe. Our own country was to be content with its usual idealistic goose egg.

The chickens are now coming home to roost. We shall pay and pay heavily for the next generation for this foreign policy.

I was greatly concerned when I listened to the President's address this morning and I observed the Members of both Houses as they sat here. The President was received very graciously and with some enthusiasm, but his remarks were treated with grave misgivings. There were very few interruptions by applause. Every Member of this House must feel, as I do, most apprehensive as to what the future has in store for us. The program that is recommended here is a departure from our traditional foreign policy.

While considering what the President has asked us to do, I was thinking of what a member of the Appropriations Committee, an old member, told me in conversation the other night. He said a constituent of his informed him that a group of dealers from Canada purchased surplus property which had been given to Greece by the United States, and made a profit of \$12,000,000 by reselling this property to the Russian Government. The gentleman from Massachusetts, our good friend, the minority whip, says that the people are looking to the Capital of the United States or to the Kremlin. I do not know about that. If we in the United States realize and recognize the truth of that statement and if we are selling or giving our surplus property to nations or to dealers who in turn are selling it to the Kremlin, then I say we should call a halt. It is amazing that there is such a conflict of thought and action.

Russia is buying up this property in wholesale lots, on the one hand and on the other hand it is quite obvious that we are asked to help Greece to keep Russia in her place. I am more concerned not by what the President said but what he did not say. We find that all of the truth is not being given to us. Perhaps our leaders know more about this than we do. I am willing to follow them. I am anxious to follow them.

**THE SPEAKER.** The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

**MR. HERTER.** Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski].

AN ANSWER TO THE PLEA FOR THE SALVATION OF GREECE

**MR. O'KONSKI.** Mr. Speaker, the speech by President Truman concerning the necessity for our taking over the affairs of Greece should make every red-blooded American citizen demand that it is time for a rendezvous with destiny.

The speech by President Truman clearly indicates that our national leadership is following the same path of stupidity that our Nation has followed for the past 15 years in international affairs.

The tragedy of Greece is an American tragedy more than it is the tragedy of Greece. The tragedy of Greece is a plain indication that our national leadership has no more idea of which direction it is going now than it had for the past 15 years. The tragedy of Greece is a tragedy of our own making and our own thinking.

From 1933 to 1941, the leadership of our country was crying for the poor Chinese who were being slaughtered by the Japanese. But at the same time our country was feeding scrap iron, gasoline, and money to the Japanese war machine. From 1933 to 1941, our national leadership gave the Japanese war machine more than a billion dollars in cash. In that period our national leadership gave the Japanese more than 8,000,000 tons of steel. In that period, our national leadership gave the Japanese tanks and high octane gasoline to a degree where Japan had enough war materials and money from the United States of America to fight a war against us for 1 year. We paid in blood, sweat, and tears and hundreds and thousands of our boys bled

and died in order to protect us from the Japanese war machine which our national leaders encouraged and financed.

From 1933 to 1938 our national leadership gave Germany more than \$1,000,000,000 to rebuild its economy. While in America we had bread lines and soup lines, our national leadership was dishing out hundreds of millions of dollars to help the poor and starving German people. While our people were in bread lines and soup lines, with our money Germany built seven large stadiums and the German people accumulated savings of \$10,000,000,000. In that period the German people also spent more than \$40,000,000,000 on their war machine. The German war machine was built up and encouraged by the national leadership of the United States of America from 1933 to 1938. Hundreds and thousands of our boys bled and died to stop this German war machine from taking over America. This is the war machine that American leadership encouraged and financed. This was done under the guise of stopping communism in Europe.

Then we turn around and we pour \$10,000,000,000 into Communist Russia and build them a war machine wherein they are able to take over not only all of the countries surrounding Russia, but all of Balkan, Baltic, and central Europe. With our \$10,000,000,000 we made them so strong that they are now threatening the peace of the world. I repeat, it is American money and American capital and American leadership that built the Russian war machine to the point that now they threaten the peace of the world. Again, the leadership of the United States of America has created its own destiny.

Honest and sincere people would think that we should have learned a lesson. However, even after this last war, World War II, we knew no other course except to follow the old course. Since the war ended, our national leadership has poured 650,000,000 of our taxpayers' money into Communist Yugoslavia. With the money that we gave them in the last 2 years, Yugoslavia has built a standing army of 600,000 men. With our money Yugoslavia has the best-dressed and the best-fed army in the world. With our money, Yugoslavia has not only built its own army but it has called in the revolutionists of Greece and trained them in typical Communist tactics. The Yugoslavian Communist Government now is infiltrating those revolutionists into Greece to start a revolution and civil war in Greece. Now we are asked to stop that revolution and civil war in Greece. I repeat, it is American capital and American leadership that built up Communist Yugoslavia and its Communist agents in Greece.

Now comes the sad and tragic end. Now comes the President of the United States of America before the Congress of the United States of America, pleading that we have got to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into Greece in order to save Greece from communism. First, we give \$650,000,000 to Communist Yugoslavia to strengthen communism in the Balkans, and now our President asks us to pour in hundreds of millions of dollars in order to stop that which we ourselves

created with American capital and with American leadership.

There are those who call this policy American and humanitarian. There are those who say that this is accepting our place of leadership in the world. There are those who call it expediency and appeasement. There are others who call this different sorts of things. But I for one, call our foreign policy the utmost of stupidity. As far as I can see, in the past 14 years we have had only one principle involved in our foreign policy. That principle has been to try to buy a potential enemy with money. With that money we have enabled our potential enemies to build up strength to the point where they threaten the peace of the world. Then along comes the same national leaders who say that we have to dish out additional billions of dollars to stop the threat which we ourselves financed and which we ourselves created. If this kind of policy is not plain stupidity, pray tell me what is it? It is time for a "rendezvous with destiny." The President has told us nothing new. He merely confirmed the conviction that I had a long time ago that the foreign policy of the United States of America is the same stupid and blind foreign policy that this country has carried out in the past 14 years. It seems that the only destiny that our President has indicated for our country is more blood, sweat, and tears. More billions to build up potential enemies. So that there will be more billions poured out to stop the potential enemies. There may be those who call this good business. But to me it is plain stupidity.

If this administration is sincere in its attempt to stop communism—they should start at home. Why fight communism in Greece and at the same time tolerate communism at home? If the President had stated that he is beginning an offensive against communism by discharging Federal employees and by clearing the Communists out of America first I could then go along with him. But why send out millions to Greece to be followed by our boys' blood—only to find that while we are trying to save Greece from communism—they took over our own Nation? I say keep our money and our boys to keep communism out of America. To continue to pour out millions abroad is merely playing the Communist game to bankrupt us and destroy us. We can stop communism in Europe most effectively by refusing to finance it. Thus far our own Nation has been the biggest financier of communism in Europe. It is time we stopped being stupid and played smart for a change.

The Greek tragedy is merely the result of our chickens coming home to roost. To stop communism in Greece we must first stop breeding and producing Communist chickens. This is the common-sense thing to do. But there has been no common sense in our foreign policy for 15 years. Do not expect any for a long time to come. Just dishing out.

If we want to stop communism, how about stopping it at home first? How about stopping communism in South America? How about helping Spain keep communism out of Spain? We have a chance of stopping communism in those places. We have no chance of

keeping it out of Greece. We dished out \$650,000,000 to finance communism in the Balkans. Two hundred and fifty millions to stop it will not help a bit.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular business of the day and any other special orders on Monday, the 17th of March, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts from an address made by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and an editorial from the New York Journal of Commerce.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LOBCE] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, and that immediately thereafter the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

#### IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2404), with Mr. DIRKSEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take the floor on the measure before us, but in view of the fact that the President appeared before a joint session of the Congress today to inform us of the seriousness of the world situation, I feel that I should say just a word in behalf of the pending bill.

As you all know, there is a very serious copper shortage in the country. It is becoming worse daily. At the time this measure was reported we did not look upon it as a war measure, but I am afraid perhaps this is the first measure to be considered in preparation for "World War No. 3." I hope not, but anyway let me urge upon all of you to support this measure because it really is an emergency measure.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman feel that the passage of this bill, H. R. 2404, would be in the interest of national defense?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I think so; I think so.

Mr. MURDOCK. I take direct issue with my friend in that respect. In the long run this bill would be adverse to our national security.

Mr. KNUTSON. That, of course, is a matter of opinion but the trade said that if this legislation is passed it will greatly facilitate the importation of copper into this country.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The evidence submitted to the committee indicated that there was a shortage of copper of all types in this country.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In my opinion anything which puts copper into the hands of our people, the durable and nondurable consumer goods which we need, which we expect and which we demand to guarantee this domestic program so that we can finance the international programs will be in the interest of national defense.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly support this measure. As far as I am concerned, I should like to see the date "1950" stricken from the bill in order that our manufacturers who make articles that require copper may understand that they are not going to run into this condition again in 1950.

Here is the predicament we are in today: A large portion of our machinery is coming to a standstill for the want of copper, a strategic material. I know because I have recently written to all the manufacturers of transformers in the United States urging them to speed up the manufacture of transformers in

order that we may extend electricity to the farm homes of the country. They tell me they cannot do so because of the lack of strategic materials, and every single one of them, if I remember correctly, mentioned copper.

I should like to see this tax entirely removed and no limitation put on the importation of copper, because, as I said, industries have closed down. When they can start getting copper then we will begin to get the materials and machinery we need. But if they are to understand that they are going to have this tax placed back on them in 1950 it may deter them from going into business at all.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] said a moment ago that copper was a strategic material or defense material; that is true. You cannot run any kind of machinery without copper.

I appreciate the attitude of the gentlemen from those States where copper is produced, but the truth is they are not producing enough copper to supply the demands, and the rest of the country cannot stop, close down, and wait for a supply to be built up. Unless something of this kind is done we are not going to have enough copper to do business with. I am not so sure that this is going to bring the relief needed, for the simple reason that unfortunately goods are bringing more in American money in foreign countries than they are in the United States in a great many instances. I know a good deal of that was due to OPA, to the price-fixing policy. We fixed the price of sugar and everybody wondered why they could not get sugar. On looking around we found that they got higher prices in American dollars for sugar in foreign countries than they did in the United States, and the sugar refiners were making it and shipping it to other nations.

So I suggest, and I hope it will be carried out, that the date "1950" will be stricken from the bill.

I want to again appeal to the Committee on Banking and Currency to look into the operation of the Federal Reserve System and protect us from any further financial inflation while at the same time prices are being held down at home to the detriment of the American people.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think we should blame the Federal Reserve System so much. The policy of the Treasury, the policy of this Government, too, is for the commercial banks of this country to purchase Treasury issues in order to finance these various things, and I think therein lies inflation.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that, but it comes through the Federal Reserve Board, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know anything of the kind, because I know that the banks have absorbed \$150,000,000,000 in bonds.

Mr. RANKIN. I will show the gentleman if I have the time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am just as familiar with the situation as the gentleman is.

Mr. RANKIN. You will see that we have \$25,000,000,000 of Federal Reserve notes out, and they are increasing every month.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And so are the bonds held by the commercial banks.

Mr. RANKIN. When the Federal Reserve System holds and issues money to anybody who is willing to buy bonds it increases inflation. Let me tell the gentleman something else. In 1920 there were \$6,000,000,000 in circulation. Today we have \$28,950,000,000 in circulation. I say the Committee on Banking and Currency better look into it and check this inflation of the currency before it is too late.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question but what the United States of America and its entire industrial system is in a critical condition for want of copper. Of course, there is a reason for that. In the first place, prior to the war and beginning about 1935, we started shipping copper to Japan until we finally shipped that country 350,000 tons, which would have carried us for some time. Then we found ourselves in desperation to get the necessary copper in order to prepare for war. It finally comes down to the time where, after this message today, there is not a man on the floor of this House who feels too certain as to what the future is going to bring forth. In view of that message, and in view of the situation that has developed in the industries of this country for want of copper, we need all the copper we can get for months to come from every mine in the world. The difficulty will be to procure it.

There was a stock of 500,000 tons under control of the Metals Reserve, but gradually that has been whittled down now until there is supposed to be just about 55,000 tons, which is being allocated now at such a rate that it will not keep our industries going but a few months hence; so the necessity for this bill.

I think it should be limited to the period provided in the bill, but others may think it should be limited for a less time. At any rate, one thing is absolutely certain, and that is that the domestic mines of the country cannot produce the copper necessary for the industries of our Nation to function during several years to come. In the first place, they cannot develop the new lodes of ore in their mines that were reduced to a low level of production because much of the mining labor was drafted into the Army. Now we have got to wait until such time as they can develop these new lodes and start in producing in larger quantities. That perhaps they can do within the time limit in this bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. There is another sad fact, too. No agency of the Government is making any effort to establish any stock pile because they have not anything to establish it with.

Mr. REED of New York. No person can possibly know how much copper we are going to get as a result of eliminating this 4 cents a pound or \$80 a ton from the price, but at the world price and the present domestic price, naturally the copper from South America and the other foreign mines is going to go to the markets where they can receive the highest pay. So it is necessary to reduce this tariff in order that whatever foreign copper is available we can get as a result of the reduction of this tariff on copper.

Never, until the message today, was it more important to have our industries ready to function and to have a stock pile for future eventualities, than right now. So, I urge upon this Congress at this critical time to support this bill, and that we begin to lay in a stock pile so that our industries can begin to build it up. Copper is not only needed for consumption goods in this country, but even in the cities you will find them operating their electric plants without an adequate supply. There is a company in one of my cities that uses more copper than any other municipal plant in the State of New York, and they only have a short supply ahead; they cannot get new transformers, which require copper. So, the word comes in from all parts of the country that copper is needed. Now, after the President's message, I say again that this situation is critical, and that we should start the flow of copper, if it can be obtained, into this country, so that we can function as a Nation both in peace as well as in war. Talk about inflation. One of the ways to solve inflation, of course, is to stop pushing the currency in circulation, which we are doing now, to the tune of about \$162,000,000,000, when we figure in credit currency. The most important thing today is to create consumer goods in such quantities that the people will not be bidding against each other for them. So I consider this bill a major bill of importance, and I hope that there will not be one vote against it when the time to vote comes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from New York that this is a very important bill. I agree with the gentlemen of the Committee on Ways and Means and with the authors of the two bills heard by that committee that there is an extreme shortage in the copper industry, and that that shortage must be supplied at the first opportunity.

However, I do not agree with the idea that a 3-year suspension of the 4-cent excise tax should be put into effect, because, unlike any other Representative in this House, I am in the position where the biggest producer in my area not only produces copper domestically but imports from South America as well. I come from Butte, the biggest mining camp on the face of the globe, and in that camp is the richest hill on earth. We have produced almost \$3,000,000,000 worth of copper ore during our history. If you are willing to remove this copper excise tax for 3 years, and maybe longer, you are willing to help sound the death knell to towns like Butte

and Anaconda, which depend on the mines and the mines only. What you are doing in effect is putting a prohibition upon American high-cost producers like Butte and giving an added advantage to low-cost producers like those in Chile, Peru, Rhodesia, Katanga, Canada, and elsewhere. If this Congress takes away the protection that we need, I can tell you right now that Butte and Anaconda will become ghost towns.

The cost of copper since the first of November has risen from 12 to 21½ cents. What encouragement do you think is needed for these copper importers on the basis of that kind of a price rise within a 6 months' period? Surely the lifting of this 4-cent excise tax is not going, in my opinion, to bring in much more in the way of copper poundage, but I am willing to be reasonable, in view of the situation as it exists at this time, to give this matter a trial. I am opposed to a 3-year suspension. I intend to support as much as I can the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Colorado, putting the termination date for this suspension at March 31, 1949, instead of March 31, 1950. It was my intention to offer an amendment limiting the time of suspension to 1 year, but in view of what has occurred in this Chamber today I will support my colleague's amendment as the best that we can get.

This country generally produces about 900,000 tons of copper a year. We are short at the present time around 400,000 tons of our yearly needs. It is true that we do not have more than 55,000 tons on hand in this country and therefore an emergency does exist. But I am wondering if some of these copper importers are not holding back to see if this bill will not pass, and then bring in their copper and get away from paying the excise tax. I recall the testimony of the former Senator from Connecticut, a very able gentleman, Mr. Danaher. He appeared before the committee and made the statement, I believe, that an American company had 28,000 tons of copper in bond. If I understand that correctly, that copper is already mined and ready to be brought into this country, but it is not being brought in despite the great emergency which does exist because of the possibility that this 4 cents excise tax will be done away with. I do not think that is the right thing to do. These industries which depend on copper and the farmers who are looking forward to the rural-electrification program and the copper-using industries are entitled to that copper at the earliest opportunity. Certainly the increase in price from 12 to 21½ cents in less than a 6-month period is enough inducement for any producer to bring his copper in and bring it in at a very good profit.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. The world price of copper today is slightly in excess of 22½ cents. The copper price in this country is 21½ cents. In the light of that, is it difficult for the gentleman to understand why that copper stock pile

in Chile to which the gentleman refers does not flow to the American market?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Not at all, because if you allow that copper to come in after this bill is passed it will mean that instead of getting 21½ cents on the American market they will be getting 25½ cents, because they can add this excise tax which has been taken off to the price they get for their copper.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this bill to suspend the import tax on copper until March 31, 1950, has many inherent dangers with respect to the copper industry of this country and for that matter to many other industries as well. Looking ahead for a period of 3 years and trying to legislate on specific matters on the assumption that conditions throughout this country and the world will remain fixed and rigid for that period may easily create more problems than it solves. The President's speech this afternoon on the subject of Greece and Turkey is pretty convincing proof of the unsettled condition of world affairs. The production of copper contributes to our natural wealth in time of peace and is of still more vital importance to the defense of our country in time of war.

To take any action which might have the over-all effect of hampering the production of copper on a sound economic basis would be the sheerest folly. Furthermore past experience has shown that foreign copper has invaded an unprotected copper market to a point where it was threatening destruction of an important segment of this great industry. In my district in the Northern Peninsula of Michigan—one of the great copper-producing areas of this country—we know from bitter experience during the last depression, the devastating effect that the importation of low-tariff copper can have on our economy. It virtually wiped out the copper industry in our area and was the direct cause of a prolonged period of unemployment. No one wants that to happen again either in northern Michigan or elsewhere in the country.

Everyone admits that presently there is a serious shortage of copper; but those who assume that this is anything but a temporary condition are ignoring the underlying causes of the shortage. It is equally fallacious to assume that the present shortage will continue for a period of 3 years. Moreover, this assumption is downright dangerous and would actually jeopardize the principles of real conservation and the development of future copper resources.

We must recognize the basic proposition that to be successful and economic the copper-mining business must be a continuing one. It is not the type of enterprise that can be opened and closed at will. In order to survive, it must be maintained as a "going industry" if it is to be an effective instrument of national defense. This is particularly true of an underground mine which can suspend operations without danger of damage only on a very temporary basis because the minute the pumps are stopped and

the mine fills with water, reopening becomes an almost impossible task. Furthermore, in order for the copper industry to survive, it must be able to explore and make new developments as the old sources of supply are depleted. The low price of copper since 1931 has discouraged this type of exploration and development. This is another important reason why we should not legislate too far into the future. The copper industry must know where it is going if it is to do its full share in respect to national defense. It must have protection against the importation of cheap copper except on a very temporary basis and until such time as the present emergency has been corrected.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we should not suspend the copper import tax for a longer period than June 30, 1948. If this temporary shortage still exists, we can make a further suspension of the import tax on the basis of facts as they exist a year from today. There is not a Member of this House who can accurately say what our needs will be a year hence—let alone 3 years hence.

I am going to support the amendment to limit the suspension to 2 years because I think it will be some improvement to the bill as reported. Actually, we ought not go beyond June 30, 1948.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, listening to the speech of the President of the United States here today brought home further the fact to me that we need more copper. I hate to think of war. It is deplorable, in my estimation, having been a member of the armed forces in this last conflict. But I just want to quote Secretary of War Patterson, who said that "An army without copper would be an army without speed, maneuverability, fire power, or communication. It would not last one day in battle."

Mr. Chairman, at the present time we do not have copper. In the event of an emergency, which God forbid, we certainly would be in a very weakened condition.

I have heard the remarks of the gentlemen from the West and I appreciate their position. They talk about unemployment. In Connecticut, particularly in my own district, we have great brass mills. One of these employs around 15,000 people. I have been told by the men who are running these factories that if we do not have copper by the end of March, that is, this month, we will have unemployment. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, to insure continued employment of the workman, not only in my district and the State of Connecticut, but all over the United States I urge the gentlemen of this Congress to give me their support in order that this bill will be passed here in the House.

I do not suppose it is possible for anyone to tell exactly how much copper will be required over the next 3 years. I do not suppose it is possible for anyone to tell exactly how much domestic copper will be produced in the same period. It has reasonably been estimated, however, that our requirements will run around 1,400,000 tons per year,

while our production is estimated at about 900,000 tons per year. Obviously, we will be short 500,000 tons per year and that deficit can only be made up by imports. I know that the gentlemen from the West claim that my bill will affect the mining production in this country. In my opinion, it will not. I personally would withdraw my bill immediately if I thought for one moment that the American mines could meet the demands of the present day.

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

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. I believe it should appear in the Record in connection with the gentleman's remarks that the gentleman from Connecticut, who is one of the new Members in the House of Representatives, is making a great record of accomplishment here, as evidenced by the fact that he is the author of the pending bill. I commend him for the eminent fairness with which he approached this very difficult situation and especially commend him for his farsighted good judgment in recognizing quite some time ago the very critical situation confronting the whole country by reason of the copper shortage, and moving to do something about it on his own initiative.

My information is that the very considerable stock pile of copper which had been accumulated by the Government, and which was in existence something like a year ago, has been almost used up in an effort to supply our domestic needs until it now seems that very shortly, unless something is done, we shall be without any such stock pile.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is correct, and I want to thank the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

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

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman tell us at the present time what the domestic market price of copper is?

Mr. PATTERSON. At the present time, it is 21½ cents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the open foreign market price, roughly?

Mr. PATTERSON. I believe it is 22.85 cents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What causes that difference? Who sets the market price here? Is the Government buying our copper at the present time? Why is this market lower than the other market?

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to only ask the indulgence of the House briefly in support of the pending bill, hoping that as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means I may be able to give some information that will be helpful in the consideration of this measure, H. R. 2404. As has been stated by other members of the Committee on Ways and Means who have preceded me, this measure was unani-

mously reported by the committee. It is here for the purpose of relieving a very acute shortage of copper in this country.

Prior to the recent war, this country was about self-sufficient in copper. We produced approximately the amount of copper that we needed or consumed. During the war, a stock pile of copper was built up by the Government, and at the close of the war, as I now remember the figure, we had about 655,000 tons in the possession of the Metal Reserves Corporation of the RFC; that is, Government copper. During the year 1946 we produced in this country about 604,000 tons, which was about one-half of the amount we consumed.

In the year 1947 it is estimated we will produce about 950,000 tons and that we will need about 1,400,000 tons, the result being that we will have a shortage of about 450,000 tons of copper during this year. Of the 655,000 tons that we had in the stock pile at the end of the war, about 600,000 tons have already been used and as of the 1st of March we had only about 55,000 tons left in the stock pile. The estimate was that we would use about 40,000 tons of that during the month of March. So that early in April we will be out of any copper in the stock pile, because about April 1 we will have only about 15,000 tons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

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

Mr. COOPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I think the gentleman ought to be fair.

Mr. COOPER. I am trying to be fair.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman well knows that every copper mine in the West was closed for 4 months during the last year. Of course they were not producing copper.

Mr. COOPER. I have not said anything about whether they were closed or open. I am talking about what copper we have in the country and the need for this legislation, as it was presented to our committee. That is all I am trying to do. I am trying to convey to the House the information that was presented to the committee during the hearings held on this bill. It certainly is well recognized by everybody that copper is one of the most essential of the materials we have to use in this country. It is thought, by all of those who are in a position to know about the situation, that this legislation is badly needed.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The most optimistic claim on the part of those speaking for the copper producers was that we would produce locally 950,000 tons next year.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. I think the most optimistic estimate was 950,000 tons. Some of those in a position to know as much about it as anybody, said that was probably 100,000 tons more than would be produced.

But that is giving the benefit of the highest estimate given to the committee. Even if we do get production of 950,000 tons, according to the estimated consumption we will be about 450,000 tons short. So this bill is here only for the purpose of trying to meet the critical need of a material that is vital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FOOTE].

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to speak here for a few minutes today in support of the bill introduced by my neighbor and good friend, JIM PATTERSON. The problems that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] has in his district are a great deal like mine. We have manufacturing concerns in our districts which use copper. It is their principal raw material. Within the last month I have received letters and telegrams from various concerns in my district calling attention to the very serious situation with which they are confronted and which has a vital effect upon the production of the country at large, in my opinion. Why do I say that? I have before me a letter received from the Rockbestos Products Corp., of New Haven. That company is engaged in the manufacture of insulated electric wires and cables. Its principal raw material is copper, and its entire operation is dependent upon copper supply. The president of the company states that a slow-down in the wire and cable industry would cause layoffs in the electrical manufacturing industry from toasters to Diesel locomotives, as well as in the automotive and other industries that must have wire and cable to keep their people employed.

A similar plea for action has been received by me from the G. & O. Manufacturing Co., of New Haven, who manufacture radiators, and likewise from the Cuneo Engineering Corp., of Meriden, manufacturers of filters and electrical automotive equipment.

I trust that this bill will be given approval by the Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, the primary question before us today concerns the shortage of raw copper. The secondary question is our recourse under the circumstances.

My distinguished colleague from the land of steady habits, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] has proposed a measure and means of coping with the pressing situation of this critical shortage. He has taken cognizance of the importance of this shortage to the manufacturers of his district in the State of Connecticut, and to the major manufacturers throughout the Nation. He has also talked about the effect on the great many people who are employed in these industries.

In view of the vital message we heard delivered by the President earlier today, it seems to me we ought to take measures immediately for the replenishment

of the depleted stock of this raw copper. Transformers have been mentioned as one important item greatly in need for which copper is lacking. There are many necessities requiring copper—mentioning a few such as housing for veterans, refrigerators, appliances and so forth.

I wish at this time to join the commendation that our majority leader made and say that, in view of the message we heard this afternoon, the proposal by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] indicates unassailable good sense.

The bill H. R. 2404 was unanimously reported by the committee. I urge that each Member vote in accordance with the committee's recommendations.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK].

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, at the time we are thinking of a copper shortage in this country, I want to call attention to the plight of the copper-mining industry in New Mexico. Copper mining is one of our largest industries. It is carried on not only by large companies but by many small companies.

It is my opinion at this time that due to high production costs these small companies will not be able to continue their work and their business if this bill is passed today and I think that some consideration is due to the workers in those mines, and the small operators as well as to the large operators.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New Mexico has consumed 1 minute.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LOVE].

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, there is a serious copper shortage in our country today. The domestic supply is inadequate. I shall support this bill to suspend the import tax on copper, and I urge my colleagues to support it likewise.

Copper is essential to the manufacture of many industrial products. Finished steel products depend entirely on electrical equipment in which copper is most important. Because of the copper shortage the production of steel is being greatly curtailed, and production in general is being retarded. Unemployment is resulting from the scarcity of this essential metal. Many industries are planning great expansion programs to promote a greater prosperity and provide the regular employment of many more people.

These expansion programs cannot proceed until we are able to secure an adequate supply of copper necessary for the manufacture of electrical equipment and steel products necessary for the great expansion programs of our industries.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the passage of H. R. 2404 is of vital importance to hundreds of American manufacturers. We need every ton of copper that can be produced anywhere in the world. We need copper for our depleted stock pile. We need it for the building of badly needed homes.

My colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] should be complimented for the energy he has shown in bringing this bill to the attention of the Congress and the country. As a freshman in the House he has demonstrated ability to act for the benefit of his district and his country. I hope that H. R. 2404 is but the first of many bills my colleague will guide through the Congress. I, too, actively support this bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, let us face a clear situation in regard to this bill. The major part of the opposition before the committee I find came from the Democrats, although today a few of my colleagues from the West on the Republican side are pointing out the dangers in it. Yet this bill by virtually repealing a tariff duty does violence to all the traditional Republican policies with regard to tariffs and protection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Briefly.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I think the RECORD ought to be clear on this point. Under the tariff act of 1930, copper was on the free list. Many items containing copper were dutiable. Those items are not affected by this legislation one bit insofar as that tariff levy of 1930 is concerned, subject, however, to such reciprocal trade agreements as affect it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think that makes it clear. Yes; this is an excise duty; it is not a tariff duty. However, it is the equivalent of a tariff duty with the principle of protection back of it.

I want to call the attention of the Republican Members of this House to the general effect of this bill as contrary to their policy. I notice that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] took the floor here in support of the bill, saying that he, as the great advocate of rural electrification, wants to get copper into the country so that we may have transformers and all that sort of thing. I want to assure the country that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] alone outranks me in this body in interest in rural electrification. I, too, represent consumers. My people want automobiles, refrigerators, and everything that requires copper in their composition. My own son at this very minute is trying to build a home out in Arizona. He needs electrical equipment for that house. Although a veteran, he is having trouble getting it. His partner, also with veteran's preference, is having the same difficulty. Of course, I want more goods made of copper. But we better not run the risk of wrecking a defense industry such as the domestic production of copper in order that we may get a little cheaper copper for domestic consumption.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUSTON] took the floor here and said he favored this bill as a matter of national defense. I cannot see how he figures that way. To me that looks like a short-sighted policy. Are we going to take the long-run or short-run view? If we repeal or if we suspend this duty for 3 years, and that is equivalent to re-

peal, this 4-cent-per-pound duty on foreign copper, it may have the effect of making it easier to bring in foreign copper. But there is a shortage in foreign production also. I tell you that even if we repeal this 4-cent duty, you will not bring out of the ground 1 pound of copper because of this act. But you will endanger the production of copper in this country.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Briefly.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Is it not a fact that right now the Metal Reserves Corporation can go out and buy copper anywhere in the world and bring it in here and that all this will do is to make it possible for the manufacturer to get the copper for 4 cents less a pound than he would otherwise be able to?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct. Now, we better pay a little more for what we get in the way of the finished product rather than run this risk to a vital defense industry. This bill is not a matter of national defense. If we want a stock pile we can get the copper now as we got it during wartime, bring it in without any duty. That is what I recommend. We should do that concurrently with full encouragement of domestic production.

Here is the proposition: We pay 4 cents more a pound under the present law and that adds to the cost of the finished product. It is a short-range view, gentlemen, that we are taking here in order to cheapen our much-needed postwar production. Do let us be careful.

In 1937 and 1938 I pleaded with certain Members on the majority side, for God's sake let us get a reserve, for national defense, of strategic and critical materials, getting what we must abroad and at the same time developing our home supply, and yet I found Members on my own side of the aisle who said that we must get all of it abroad, and we were caught short at the beginning of a global war. What a short-range policy, instead of increasing our domestic production. Such was national defense in reverse order and this proposal is similar to it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, the mining industry of Nevada has always favored an import tax on copper as a protection of that vital mining industry in the State. I am opposed to the suspension of the import tax on copper of 4 cents for 3 years at this time or any other time.

While it is true that domestic production of copper does not now equal consumption, and that this condition will probably continue this year, we do not definitely know that this condition will extend over a period of 3 years. If such a suspension of the import tax on copper is to be made, I would rather have it extended for 1 year, and no more.

War conditions brought about the greater use of copper for materials of war, and copper production in the United States dropped last year 240,000 short tons below the 1945 production figure, all this contributing to cause the present

shortage of copper. Yet but a relatively few years ago under normal conditions our domestic production of copper was adequate for our consumption, and under normal conditions again this probably will be the case.

What mining needs in this Nation now is stimulation for the development of new ore bodies and the development of marginal ores of not only copper but of other metals and minerals which the Nation critically needs. We need stimulation for the building up of our own natural resources, rather than to jeopardize mining through the importation in the future of copper or any other metal or mineral which can be produced more cheaply in foreign countries at the expense of our own mining industry.

Any suspension of the import tax on copper for 3 years might lead toward the end of the suspension period to the importation of copper at a much lower price than it could then be produced domestically.

The copper-mining industry employs many thousands of men at high wages, as compared to the cheap wages paid in other nations, and the import tax on copper is for their protection, as well as for the protection of the copper industry.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, 8 years ago I had quite an interesting experience in assisting with the passage of Public Act 117 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. That was the first legislation authorizing the stock piling of strategic and critical materials for national defense. I did considerable work at that time with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] and some other Members who represent copper districts, in considering the critical item of copper. We went into the last war without any adequate stock pile of copper, and we know that we sweated blood throughout the war and did everything humanly possible toward getting a sufficient stock pile of copper and other critical materials in preparation for that emergency. In 1946, the evidence in the hearing shows 657,000 tons of the reserve of copper in this country was turned into domestic and civilian consumption, and so far as I can make out there has been no effective move in the direction of establishing a stock pile for national defense. Now, until we get that stock pile for national defense I am going to be very critical of any move that will thwart or stifle our efforts toward attaining that goal. Just last summer I worked with the gentlemen from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. HARLESS] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], in the matter of the bill, S. 752, and you will recall we had some real difficulty in keeping the buy-American clause in there, and also striking out the free import provision that was put in by the Senate. I give that information as evidence that I have real regard for American industry. However, our national defense needs are so desperate and so immediately at hand today that the copper producers should bear with us and support the bill now before the House. We have got to get this stock pile for na-

tional defense. That is a must, and today's appearance of the President on the floor of this House has not lessened my concern one iota in that regard. For 8 years I worked on the Committee on Military Affairs in this field. Eight years ago I had the privilege of serving on the committee of conference between the House and the Senate in building the first authorization for stock piling our strategic and critical materials, Public Law 117 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. From that day to this I have made it a point to follow our progress as a Nation in building those stock piles for national defense. I am not satisfied with the stock-pile program to date and the bill, H. R. 2404, is badly needed to help build up our reserves of copper as quickly as possible.

In the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on this bill, I asked the question of some of the witnesses, including the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS], whether he thought we could get the necessary national defense stock pile in 15 months, if the time limit of this bill were so fixed as he advocated; and he told me he could not guarantee it. I agree with the gentleman that we cannot expect the acquisition of an adequate stock pile in 15 months. For that reason I favor the passage of the bill, H. R. 2404, now before us.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill. I come from a community which all my colleagues probably would be willing to concede is the finest industrial city in the country, Rochester, N. Y. No dissent is audible. It is a community of many diversified industries, and with reference to this bill I have had more urgent telegrams and telephone calls and letters than on any other bill which has been before the House to date.

These messages come from large industries and small, from two or three of our very largest industries and from many small and medium sized concerns. Of course, we do not know exactly what effect the passage of this legislation will have in increasing the supplies of copper but we are hopeful that it will have a very good effect along those lines. These urgent messages from business executives who do not go off half-cocked, men who keep their heads on their shoulders and are not panicked into extreme positions, men upon whom the greatest reliance can be placed, inform me that unless something is done immediately, meaning by that in this month or not later than next month, to increase the supplies of copper substantially, there will be closed factories or seriously curtailed operations with thousands of people walking the streets for want of a job. They must have this copper at once.

That is only the industrial side of the picture. We have sat here today and listened to the President detail some of the unsettled conditions in the world. We cannot close our eyes to the additional need for augmenting in every way pos-

sible our supplies of this strategic material which is now being channeled elsewhere by reason of our existing prohibitive import duty. National security, as well as domestic prosperity and full employment, cry out for passage of this measure.

I am confident this bill will not seriously affect domestic copper companies. We can use in this country during the next 2 to 3 years, all the copper from all the sources which are available, both domestic and foreign. I urge very strongly the passage of this legislation.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, the issue before us today seems to be quite clear. It is not one of concern on the part of any as to whether there is too much copper available or too little, all appearing to agree that there is an urgent need in the United States for additional copper. The issue before you is the one that was before the committee a few days ago when we were considering this matter, namely, for how long a period of time will it be safe or will it be advisable for the Congress to suspend the import tax on copper.

Our friends from the States producing copper made their appearance before the committee and urged that we limit that period of suspension to June 30, 1948. It is also true that one of the individuals representing the Government suggested that we might well end the suspension period on June 30, 1948, but it was clear in his mind, as it was clear in the minds of the members of the committee, that if we suspended the import tax for a period of 1 year the committee would be back before the Congress, sometime prior to June 30, 1948, asking you again to suspend the import tax on copper and ore concentrates for another period of time, possibly 1 or 2 years.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understand correctly what the gentleman is saying, there is no assurance that the suspension for 1 year would bring about a meeting of the shortage.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman anticipates me. I was coming to that point.

The committee was informed that probably the copper produced in Chile for the next few months would not be available to the United States, that copper having been contracted for some time ago, so that if the Congress merely suspends the import tax on copper for a period of 1 year we would have no assurance whatsoever that we would obtain any material quantity of copper from Chile.

The reason the committee, in my opinion, decided on the longer period of suspension is that if we suspend the import tax for a period of 2 or 3 years the people who process copper into copper goods will have some degree of assurance as to what the situation will be—enough assurance that they can go into Chile and deal with the producers of copper ore on the basis of their needs 1,

2, and 3 years ahead; whereas if we only suspend this import tax for 1 year they will not be in that position.

I have great sympathy for the plight of my friends from the Western States. None of us desires to do anything in Congress to destroy the great copper industry. Those Government witnesses, however, who came before the committee from the CPA, the Tariff Commission, and the Bureau of Mines all advised us that there would be a demand in the United States, all things being equal, of at least 1,400,000 tons of copper next year, the year after, and the year after that possibly, and that the production in the United States could not be in excess of 950,000 tons for any one of those 3 years. That being true, then all of the copper produced in Chile per year, which I understand is something like 600,000 tons, still would not equal the demands that we would have from our civilians for copper goods and also permit the Government to buy some copper during the period of the next 3 years to stockpile against any future emergency, as the gentleman from Iowa and many others of us desire.

It seems that the legislation before us does afford us the first opportunity we have had to permit the Federal Government, through the Army and Navy Munitions Board to obtain copper for stock-piling purposes. Certainly, your mines in Arizona and New Mexico under the legislation passed with your assistance last year, if they do not find an outlet in the civilian market, will find that market by coming to the Federal Government and the Army and Navy Munitions Board.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. At a price which will be the world market price. Is that not true?

Mr. MILLS. The world market price now is higher than our market price. It is 22½ cents or 22.85 cents as against 21½ cents.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Is it not true that every witness who came before the committee said that it was impossible to predict what world conditions would be for more than one year?

Mr. MILLS. Except that in view of the fact that there is such a tremendous shortage of copper in the world, none of them felt that the supply of copper in the world markets would equal world demands within a reasonable period—certainly not within a year or 2 years.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Provided, however, the world manufacturing conditions remain the same a year from now as they are today.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly; if we have a depression, we probably could not use over 600,000 tons of copper.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The fact remains that the entire committee heard all of the evidence and came to the conclusion unanimously that this bill as written should be reported out.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct. I was one of those who in the beginning considered the matter from the viewpoint of a suspension of 1 year.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Concerning the evidence furnished, is it not true that these were closed hearings and that not more than three or four Members appeared in opposition and that the copper mining industry itself did not appear, or rather had no chance to appear, in opposition to the bill?

Mr. MILLS. The members of the committee felt that the gentleman from Arizona now interrogating me was fully able to take care of the industry. It is because of your concern, along with others from copper producing districts, that acceptance of an amendment for a 2-year suspension is being considered.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made on more than one occasion during this debate that inadequate hearings were held on this question of the urgency of the copper shortage in this country. The Ways and Means Committee has in its files some 200 communications from the industry, from producers to the small fabricators from all over this country, attesting to the urgent need for some relief in the copper situation.

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

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Just to make myself clear on this, not that I am contending there was not sufficient evidence of a shortage of copper; all admit that; but my suggestion is that the hearings were not broad enough to include the copper producers so that they could show the effect of any suspension upon the industry.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I can only say to the gentleman in reply that a very large copper-producing company, one of the three largest in the world, from the State which the gentleman so well represents, filed a brief before the committee on reciprocity information of the Tariff Commission, acknowledging the serious shortage in the copper situation and saying that some action must be taken, and now, to meet the situation that exists in this country.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Did you give an opportunity to those people to show how long it would take them to meet the demand? That is the question. We admit there is a shortage of copper, but the question is how long you should suspend this and what it will do to the industry.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. As has been stated, I think the industry was very well represented by the two gentlemen who have just interrogated me.

There are a couple of facts about this picture that have not been brought out that I should like to bring out at this time. The first is that about three-quarters of the copper production of this

country comes from three large companies—Anaconda, Kennecott, and Phelps-Dodge. Of the other one-quarter of our domestic production, most of it is subsidized by the American taxpayer today to encourage the construction of homes in America and to meet the requirements of the rest of our domestic industry. We just heard the gracious lady from New Mexico speak about these high-cost producers, and the fact that we should be giving some concern to the men who work in those high-cost producing mines. Well, bless your heart, the future of those high-cost mines does not depend on this bill before us today, whether it is voted up or down. The future of those high-cost producing mines is more dependent upon the continuance of the premium-payment plan, the authority for which stems from the Price Control Act which expires on the 30th of next June. The future of those companies depends on what we do on the continuation of those subsidy payments. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the question we have before us today.

Another thing: One of the gentlemen from Arizona, Mr. MURDOCK, I believe, said why could not our taxpayers pay the additional \$80 a ton and bring it in over that excise tax wall, and thereby build up the stock pile that is so sorely needed and supplement the supply available to domestic industry. I will tell you why.

If we import 500,000 tons of copper on which the \$80 per ton tax is added, that higher figure then becomes the price for all copper in the United States.

Therefore we cannot figure merely the tax on our imported copper, but we must consider the added cost to all the copper industry of the United States, and, in the final analysis, the cost to the American consumer.

May I refer you to the letter from C. E. Wilson, president of General Electric, which appears at page 78 of the printed hearings. Mr. Wilson stated that payment of the 4-cent excise tax would place an additional burden of \$120,000,000 annually on the American consumer, based on present consumption.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time, 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to alleviate the acute shortage of copper in the United States. Our committee went into this matter very thoroughly. We had witnesses from the Treasury Department, from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, from the Bureau of Mines, from the Tariff Commission, and from the Civilian Production Administration. They were all of one mind and in accord, and testified that there was an acute shortage of copper in this country, which is essential to our national building program.

This bill was reported unanimously by our committee, after most thorough hearings and consideration. It has been stated that those who opposed the bill in the shape in which it was brought out, especially the copper mining industry of this country, were not given any hearing.

I am glad to say that Members of Congress from that section, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], and other House Members appeared before our committee and discussed the subject fully and presented the side of the copper producing section of this country fully and ably.

Our committee went into this proposal thoroughly and with an open mind and as a result of our deliberations, I repeat, we reported this bill unanimously.

Nothing can demonstrate more clearly and convincingly that there is an acute shortage of this vital material than the fact that the national building program during this reconstruction period is being crippled on account of the shortage of this very vital and necessary material.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON]. I, too, am a veteran. I think it is quite obvious that a shortage of copper does exist. I know there is a serious shortage of copper that is not being met because the district I have the honor of representing has one town in it, Evansville, Ind., where two of the largest manufacturers of refrigerators in the world have their factories. They will be closed and 11,300 people, my constituents, will be out of work in 30 days if we do not get this copper.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

I believe in this program for a number of very definite reasons. In the first place, I come from a district which made an enormous contribution industrially to the war but which now is threatened with a very serious copper shortage, particularly in the city of Bridgeport, in the city of Stamford, and also in Shelton and Norwalk, and in other cities in my district there will be widespread unemployment if this copper is not forthcoming.

I believe the people of this country have a right to buy copper-made goods. I believe that we must think first and foremost of the American customer. I also feel that in this perilous time we cannot handicap ourselves with respect to our foreign policy by a shortage of copper.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired; all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the import tax imposed under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with the day following the date of the enactment of this act and ending with the close of March 31, 1950.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROCKWELL: On page 1, line 8, strike out "1950" and insert "1949."

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, for the past hour I have listened to the discussion of this bill. It does not seem to me that we are very far apart. The gentleman on my right and the gentleman on my left who represent areas where copper is produced are worried only about the future of our industry as far as it affects raw materials.

There seems to be no question but that there is a great shortage of copper in this country. The present question is, Can we in 1 or 2 years speed up our domestic production so that we may by that time produce the amount of copper desired? As has been stated here by one of the Members, during the past year the production of copper has upped in the United States from 600,000 tons to 900,000 tons. Day before yesterday I spoke with one of the large producers from the mines of Colorado, and he told me that they had not been able to do the exploration work that was necessary during the past few years. He said it was his opinion there was no question but what we could produce any amount of copper needed if we had the exploration work done.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want the gentleman to know that I am in wholehearted accord with his amendment. But I think it also should be brought out that as far as we are concerned, those of us who come from the copper-producing areas, we realize that a delicate situation exists and we want to cooperate to the fullest extent. In my opinion, about 2 years is the limit.

The gentleman has mentioned something about cost. I have some figures here showing that in the United States it cost between 12½ and 16 cents to produce 1 pound of copper. In Chile it cost 6.3; in Canada it cost absolutely nothing. Copper is all clear profit because it is a byproduct of silver and gold. In the Belgian Congo it cost 6½ cents. Now, that is what we have to consider in this proposition. Our costs are so high, averaging from 12½ to 16 cents.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I think that is the point at issue. It is the question of production at home and abroad. I do not believe that anybody on the Republican side of the aisle wishes to harm the domestic copper industry.

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

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Some of us might express the hope that certain gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who have become such keen advocates of tariff protection to industry will be a little more consistent. They apparently raise their voices only when the products in their own districts are involved.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered is an amendment to give the men of the West the opportunity to find out in 2 years if they can produce the amount of copper needed. At the end of that time we can review the situation. That is all my amendment does.

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

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am in support of the gentleman's amendment. Is it not true that the mining industry is of such a nature that you cannot turn on and off production as you would water at the spigot or faucet, and is it not true also that it is a false philosophy that this country has become a have-not Nation with regard to copper? Certainly we have the copper in the ground if we will only keep it in production.

Mr. ROCKWELL. The gentleman is right. When the mines are shut down and are filled with water it costs many millions of dollars to open them again.

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

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

Mr. REED of New York. That is true not only with reference to producing copper but in giving it away to all the nations of the earth. May I say to the gentleman in a spirit of harmony and to facilitate matters that I am perfectly willing, and I think I speak the sentiment on this side of the House, to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of this House from the copper-producing areas of the country should be pleased with the passage of this bill as it is indicative of a protection to their industries in the years ahead. During the war the imposition of the import tax was lifted. Congress is now given the opportunity of lifting that tax permanently, letting you go into the future without any tariff protection, or giving you a suspension and a certainty that when this year or 2-year period is up you will again have the protection which your industry needs. The House is today passing this bill, and if the other body agrees to the legislation, it will mean that we are saying there must be protection afforded the domestic copper industry. You can say at home that Congress has reaffirmed its intention and determination that there shall be a tariff protection given to the copper-producing States. But there is one condition. Right now, today, a branch of our Government under the State Department is offering a country to give up in the forthcoming reciprocal trade agreements some of that protection you now have.

I respectfully suggest to you gentlemen who are interested in protecting the copper-producing areas of our country that you register your objections strenuously with the State Department. Let them know that you do not want that

tariff cut. Let them know that Congress today, in passing this legislation, is reaffirming its position that the reciprocal trade agreements must not cut the protection that your industry needs.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have already registered my protest along just that line.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I earnestly hope that when other parts of this great country of ours are threatened through a policy such as that followed by the reciprocal trade agreements group, that those Members will see fit to come to our rescue and help us retain our tariff protection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I did not think it would ever be necessary for me to engage in debate with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], or the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], on the question of a tariff or that which means the same thing. It seems to me that everyone is pretty well set in their views that this bill should pass, and I believe it is possible for you to beat us with the second team. Even though you have accepted this amendment, it does not satisfy me, and if I have an opportunity to vote on this question, I will still vote against it. I think if the miners and the small operators in the mining areas knew what was being done to them today, there would be a different attitude on the part of the Members of the House. I am confident if you put this exemption into effect for 1 year or 2 years, you will put little copper mines in the country out of business. I am satisfied that is what will happen. You know, gentlemen, you cannot go into the mining business—in and out like you change your socks.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If in a year from now the gentleman can show that that is the condition in this country, that the little producers are going out of business, and the gentleman will join me in organizing the battle, we will repeal this act so that that will not happen.

Mr. GRANGER. I will say to the gentleman I have joined with him before on this issue, and I am not running away from it now, because I believe it is just as true now as it was when we were fighting the battle before. While I am glad that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado is accepted, it certainly is not satisfactory to the people who represent these small mines in the various States. I hope when this bill goes to another body for consideration that a reduction to 1 year only will be agreed upon.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask two or three questions about this bill. In the first place I should like to ask

someone on the committee—I do not care who it is that answers the question—what causes the difference between the domestic price of copper and the so-called open-market world price of copper today? Who cares to answer that question?

Mr. REED of New York. I would be under great obligation to the gentleman from Tennessee, who is one of the greatest authorities in the House, to give that information.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wonder if the gentleman from Tennessee has any information on that? What causes the difference between the domestic price of copper, which is stated to be somewhere around 21.5 cents and the open-market world price of 22.85, I believe it was? The lack of information leads me to fear there is more or less market manipulation in the copper market at this particular time.

Nobody seems to want to answer it. There must be a fundamental reason for the difference in price if it does exist.

May I ask this question: It has been stated here that our Government has a stock pile of copper which it has been unloading in the market. Has that copper which the Government was selling been unloaded on this market at a price below the world market? Can anybody answer that? The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] says, "Yes."

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I understand there have been no sales below the world market. As a matter of fact, they cannot sell it right now because they paid 17 cents. They paid a cent above the world market.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is not what I am getting at. You have a fundamental marketing question here. I think if we could smoke it out we would learn something.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. They have not unloaded any copper purchased on the world market below the world market. They could not unload that now because they bought it at 17. They would have to sell it at a loss.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not want to get into details, but it has been stated here that our market is 21½ cents against a world market of 22.85. That has been stated by members of the committee. Is that true or not?

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I do not think the committee went into that matter at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am talking about the testimony here this afternoon.

Mr. REED of New York. If the gentleman will yield, as a matter of fact the British have fixed the price on that, and our wartime agencies have fixed the price here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If our Government owns copper which it is selling to the trade, and the Government is offering that copper at a price below the world market on copper, why on earth should any foreign shipper ship copper to this

market when he can ship his copper to some other market and get a higher price? Perhaps our Government operations here are contributing greatly to the absence of copper in the United States. I should think the gentleman from the West would be inquiring as to who is manipulating this market and how it is being manipulated, if that is being done.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. It is with some hesitation that I enter on a discussion of this subject with the gentleman, but I think this might well be pointed out. During the war the entire supply of copper coming into and distributed in this country was under the control of the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. The Government under its wartime powers was bringing the copper in free of duty. The Government discontinued its purchases of copper, and discontinued that program last October or November.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And began to unload it.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. They began to unload it a year before that, month by month, bringing in a few thousand tons a month, and allocating a great number of thousands of tons per month, until today we have none. The OPA ceiling on copper was about 12 cents a pound. Since the controls have been released, the price of copper has continually gone up. The most recent price of copper of 21½ cents was fixed by an announcement of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation about a week ago last Friday, when they announced that they were offering on the market their last 55,000 tons of stock pile at the price of 21½ cents. On the next Monday, Phelps-Dodge announced that the price of copper in this country was 21½ cents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What has been the world price since last Monday?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I believe it is 22.85.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the thing I have been trying to bring out. We have no reason to assume that foreign shippers in other countries shipping goods to this market, whether it is rubber or copper, oil products or otherwise, should send their product here when they can sell them in other world markets at a higher price, and when our Government owns inventories which it is unloading at prices below world market levels from time to time. We have to learn something about this marketing proposition.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. MASON. The 4 cents a pound which our buyers had to pay as this import tariff they can now use to compete in the world market and to pay that extra cent and a fraction.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The big point is this: Our Government is now about to get out of copper. It cannot perform in the market any more, so the foreign shippers moving copper this way have an open market in which to sell. We thus begin to clear the channels of trade so goods can flow through them. That is a move in the right direction generally.

One other point: You are going to have to face within a few days a situation on crude rubber very similar to this. We may as well educate ourselves for 2 or 3 minutes here today on this matter, because copper and rubber have been almost exactly in the same position. We have to do something with rubber next week, and I am quite positive we will do it.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. In this matter of the price of copper when there is such a short supply as we have now, it is not reasonable to assume that Phelps Dodge and other big companies are going to be able to set any kind of price they desire in the open market.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; they could not do that unless they controlled the copper stocks of the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. There are no stocks to speak of.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But they are going to produce copper throughout the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. They are going to produce copper, but they do not have it right now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If they are not going to produce copper throughout the world, then why is the gentleman so fearful of goods coming into this country to compete with his own mines? If you are going to have a market of 25 or 35 cents for copper, certainly they are going to produce copper in this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. If the gentleman recalls what I said, I was very doubtful that much copper would be imported into this country under a suspension of the 4-cent copper excise tax.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman is doubtful that copper is going to come in, why does he fear foreign competition? It may be that the large copper producers of the United States control a substantial proportion of all the copper produced in foreign fields. If this be true, it may be there is some manipulation of the market on the part of our large domestic copper producers. For instance, suppose our domestic producers of crude or raw copper wanted to also enter the field of producing industrial products with a substantial copper base—thus more completely integrating their operations—and bill their foreign and domestic produced copper to themselves here in the United States at a price substantially below the world copper price. That would give them a great advantage in the United States market for fabricated copper goods. They could still sell their excess foreign production in the world market at a price substantially higher than the price at which they billed themselves

copper to be used in fabricating goods for the United States market and get along pretty well.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWARD].

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to limit the suspension of the copper import tax to a period of 2 years.

I represent a State in which copper mining is an important industry and the sole support of a very large segment of the population. We are familiar with the history of copper production over the years, and we feel very strongly that suspension of the import tax for any period longer than 2 years would be extremely dangerous.

The mining industry is one in which continued operations and development work are essential to success. A mine once closed cannot be reopened on a moment's notice to satisfy the needs of an emergency. Closing a mine inevitably results in the loss of mineral resources as well as the advantages of all the work that has gone before. Our known reserves of copper ore are now about 21,000,000 tons, not a great amount and surely not enough to permit waste or loss. Our experiences in the recent war demonstrate clearly that we cannot afford to be caught short of strategic materials should another emergency arise from the present extremely unsettled conditions of world affairs. An active mining industry is our only assurance of preparedness and the only way we can continue to have a maximum development and use of our mineral resources. I believe that the suspension of copper import taxes for longer than the 2 years suggested in this amendment would seriously impair or even destroy a large part of our presently active copper-mining industry.

The present large demand for copper is an excess demand built up during the war years when our industrial users of copper received less than half of their normal annual consumption and when large quantities of copper in use were salvaged for war materials. This demand can be satisfied in a relatively short time. The most optimistic estimate of our peacetime requirements of copper after the present excess demand is satisfied is that we will need 850,000 tons per year. Our domestic producers can produce enough to satisfy that demand.

From our experiences in the 4 years from 1929 until the present import tax was imposed we know that foreign producers can undersell our domestic producers and displace a large segment of the industry. If the present tax is suspended for a period longer than is needed to take care of the excess demand these foreign producers will be able once again to flood the market. They will be encouraged to expand their development for that very purpose, at the same time

that our producers, uncertain of the future, will be forced to curtail operations. We cannot afford to let this occur. The country needs an active and developing copper industry. The industry cannot be active or develop unless it has assurance that it will be protected in future years when the present excess demand is satisfied. For that reason I believe that we must limit this suspension as nearly as possible to the time that is necessary to satisfy this demand, and I think that any suspension for longer than 2 years will do irreparable harm to an important strategic mineral industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I take additional time, but there have been some things said here which I think should be clarified. We admit there is a shortage of copper. We in the Western States are willing to go along on a compromise as suggested until June 30, 1948. The reason we do not want a longer moratorium on the tariff is to prevent a possible destruction of the copper-mining industry. No one can predict what the world conditions will be or even what the national conditions will be for more than a year.

We are interested in seeing a healthy copper-mining industry in this country. I am sure the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle would not want to see it destroyed. Our national defense depends upon this industry. Throughout the war, the copper industry suffered. The men who worked in the industry were not exempted from the draft. The OPA froze the price of copper at 12 cents, and as a result in 1945 the mines were operating at 35 percent or 40 percent capacity. Last year we suffered a 4-month strike, not because the mines were not willing to raise the wages at the request of the miners, but because certain people in the OPA wanted the wage increase paid out of premiums instead of increased prices. Everything has been done to cripple this industry. I maintain if you extend this moratorium more than 15 months you will continue to cripple it.

I am going along with the 2-year compromise because I know 3 years would be worse. I am not conceding that we should have more than 1 year. None other an authority than John Church, who was head of the Metals Division of the War Production Board during the war, made the statement that if we lift this tariff now we would get between twenty and thirty thousand tons of copper a month from foreign sources during the next year. That would mean between two hundred and fifty and three hundred and fifty thousand tons during the next year. Copper would begin to flow into this country. If we have any kind of recession or depression, that means that the copper mines in this country in less than a year will begin to close. Once you close a copper mine and let it be flooded with water, it is closed permanently.

So, we plead with you not to destroy this industry. This industry means too

much to the American people to destroy it. Once you lower the domestic production of copper, you have weakened the defense of our Nation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] raised a very pertinent question a few minutes ago. The gentleman happens to be the author of a resolution which the committee passed this week which does practically the same thing which he tried to do in regard to cotton.

I have been primarily concerned and I am as concerned about stock piling as is the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. We handled a stock pile in 1935 and in 1940 and again in Public Law 520. I am wondering how far we are going and how many more of these metals are going to be placed in the same category as the one we are talking about today, because several more of them are in about the same position as copper. I refer to zinc, tungsten, and some others. I am not concerned about where we get this copper, especially. I want a stock pile of copper. In fact, we were faced with a message from the President today which commits us to a very definite program and I am sure every man on this floor is concerned about it.

In Public Law 520 we were very careful to protect our American manufacturers and miners. I do not know where all of this interest comes from today. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has raised a question on this world market and our domestic market price. Probably it would be wise to go along with this resolution for the length of time provided in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL]. I am hopeful that this Congress will recognize not only the scarcity of this material but that we will take immediate action on some of these other off-shore, scarce strategic metals. I think probably zinc is in a worse position than copper. We have not heard from the zinc people yet, but I expect this committee will be hearing from them very soon. I think tungsten is in about the same shape and we will be hearing from them, also.

We have adopted a very definite policy in Public Law 520, and I am hoping this Congress is not going to come out with piecemeal legislation to destroy what we have set up to protect our domestic market, because we all realize the condition we were in in 1939 and 1940. Certainly we do not want to get into that shape again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DIRKSEN, 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. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, pursuant to House Resolution 140, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CRAVENS, for the week of March 17, 1947.

To Mr. HARDY, for March 13 and 14, on account of official business.

To Mr. DORN, for Thursday and Friday of this week, on account of official business.

To Mr. SNYDER, for Thursday and Friday of this week, on account of official business.

#### PERMANENT NURSE CORPS OF THE ARMY AND NAVY AND WOMEN'S SPECIALIST CORPS IN THE ARMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, a rule has been granted on the bill (H. R. 1943) to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army, but to expedite action I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, and that general debate be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between the majority and minority sides.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if this procedure will permit amendments?

The SPEAKER. Amendments may be offered, but the 5-minute rule will apply to the discussion of amendments.

The gentlewoman from Maine asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, and that general debate be limited to 1 hour to be equally divided between the majority and minority sides.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the majority side may be controlled by the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, and the other half by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us (H. R. 1943) to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army, is the result of committee work on two bills.

H. R. 1673, introduced by the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], was a departmental bill to reorganize the Nurse Corps of the Navy and of the Naval Reserve.

H. R. 1373, introduced by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], was also a departmental bill to reorganize the Nurse Corps of the Army and the Women's Specialist Corps of the Army and of the Army Reserve. The distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has through the years contributed much to the medical program of the armed services.

One of the basic motivations of the merging of the Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committee into the single Armed Services Committee was the obvious need for greater uniformity in the administration and policies of the Army and Navy.

Under the able direction of the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], the merged committee is working toward that goal.

While there has been much controversial discussion about the merging of certain functions of the Army and Navy in the Executive Department, one area of greatest agreement as to more adaptable integration has been that of hospitalization and medical organization of the armed services.

The Subcommittee of the Armed Services, of which I am chairman, has jurisdiction over all medical matters, including hospitalization, evacuation, sanitation, health, venereal-disease control, mental hygiene, neuropsychiatry, dentistry, veterinary, medicine, nursing, dietetics, physiotherapy, and the medical organization of the armed services.

The subcommittee in striving for the goal of greater uniformity considered the two separate bills, one with respect to the Army, the other with respect to the Navy, but both with respect to the Nurse Corps of each service. In other words an Army bill and a Navy bill on the same subject were discussed at the same hearing by the same subcommittee instead of at separate hearings by separate committees as in the past. This was done because the committee was conscious of the desirability and necessity of legislating for the armed services as a whole rather than specially for each service.

After complete hearings the subcommittee reported out one bill with similar provisions for both the Army and the Navy. The full Committee on Armed Services has reported this bill, H. R. 1943, favorably to the House and it is now before us for consideration.

There is not anything new about this proposal. It is simply making permanent the wartime program for nurses, dietitians, physiotherapists, and occupational therapists.

You know the history of the Nurse Corps and the admirable service rendered by the nurses, dietitians, physiotherapists, and occupational therapists during the past war, so I will confine my remarks to the major features of the bill and to the need for its enactment.

Under present legislation both Army and Navy nurses are occupying temporary commissioned rank. With the ending of the war emergency and without new legislation the members of the Army Nurse Corps, the Women's Medical Specialist Corps of the Regular Army, and the Navy Nurse Corps will revert to relative rank and to the prewar scale of pay allowances which, under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, began with the sum of \$1,080 per annum to the top pay of \$1,800 per annum for a person having served 12 years, after which there were no increases.

Maj. Gen. Norman Kirk, Surgeon General of the United States Army, and Admiral Clifford E. Swanson, Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the United States Navy, both testified, during the course of the hearing on this bill, that a reversion to the prewar pay scales would result in a complete dissolution of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps.

This bill is in two sections. Title I pertains to the Army and title II to the Navy. Although the wording differs somewhat, the provisions are practically the same, so much so that under this proposed legislation a nurse could transfer from one branch of the service to the other without detriment to herself or to the service.

H. R. 1943 provides that—

First. Army and Navy nurses and personnel of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps of the Army would be commissioned on a permanent status, the same as all male officers.

Second. Pay, leave, money allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, mileage and other travel allowances, benefits, and emoluments would be the same as for male officers.

Third. Provisions for promotion would be the same as for male officers except that Army nurses and specialists above the rank of captain and Navy nurses above the rank of lieutenant would be chosen by selection boards.

Fourth. Retirement provisions would be the same as for male officers except that the retirement age is reduced to 55 years in the ranks above captain in the Army and above lieutenant in the Navy, and at 50 years in all ranks below captain in the Army and lieutenant in the Navy, and retirement pay would be based on 2½ percent per annum, the same as all officers of the Army and the Navy.

Fifth. The proposed legislation would establish similar provisions for nurses of both the Army and the Navy with exactly the same pay and allowances.

Failure to enact appropriate legislation would place the medical branches of the armed services in the impossible position

of attempting to compete with civilian nursing agencies which offer a more attractive salary and less personal deprivation.

This gives you briefly the purpose and provisions of this measure. Actually all the bill does is to make permanent the present program for nurses in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Navy. In other words, giving permanent commissioned status instead of the temporary wartime status.

This legislation would not result in any increased per capita expenditures over those maintained during the wartime period.

The War Department and the Navy Department favor this proposed legislation. General Kirk, Surgeon General of the Army, and Admiral Swanson, Surgeon General of the Navy, were most helpful in preparing one bill with similar provision.

The members of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee worked diligently on this measure. The chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] were most helpful to the subcommittee in their earnest participation at the hearing. The full committee discussed the bill and voted unanimously to report it out. The Rules Committee was prompt in reporting favorably upon it.

H. R. 1943 is not controversial. It is essential to the armed services and I hope this bill, H. R. 1943, will be passed by the House in its present form.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that this bill wipes out the discrimination between female officers and male officers that has heretofore prevailed?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This is the culmination of 3 or 4 years' effort by the gentleman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], now addressing the House, and also by the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], trying to eliminate this discrimination. The gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] appeared before the Military Affairs Committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress supporting a similar bill.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Yes, the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has contributed a great deal to the medical services.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And so has the gentleman from Maine.

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

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. This, however, does not wipe out the inequality and the discrimination as between male medical corpsmen, who serve 4, 8, 12, 16 years, or more, becoming very expert to the extent that they can actually operate in submarines and far out at sea. They are never any more than a pharmacist

mate. But a young nurse comes into the service and she is immediately commissioned. It does not eliminate that discrimination, it does not give a break to the corpsman who has served faithfully the Army or Navy for from 4 to 16 or 20 years. It does not give him the same status as a nurse who comes into the service, does it?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The corpsmen are not included in this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes. They still remain corpsmen.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. As far as this bill is concerned, yes.

Mr. DINGELL. Therefore, the discrimination still exists so far as the faithful corpsmen are concerned who have served in the service for many years.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. They are in a different status and are being considered by the committee in another bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Of course. They are in the status of suspended animation. That ought to be corrected, I may say to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the provisions of a bill we have now under consideration in committee, we are opening the way for those young men to aspire to a commission. In fact, there has been a great deal of discussion in the committee. I am thoroughly in accord with the gentleman's point of view that these boys should be able to go into the service and go on up through the ranks as a result of their own effort, initiative, and ability. They will have the opportunity to get commissions and we are going to make an effort in the other bill to take care of a matter of that kind.

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad to hear my friend say that because it is something that has needed correction for many years.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents the culmination of a number of weeks of effort on the part of the subcommittee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Maine is chairman, as well as many, many months of work of the old Committee on Military Affairs, as well as many, many months of work of the old Committee on Naval Affairs. We had to sit down at the table in the preparation of this bill before presentation to you; the Army and the Navy working hand and hand to try to do something for the nurse who was one of the unsung heroes of this war. There is today a shortage in the Army of 1,500 nurses. There is today a shortage in the Navy of at least 1,000 nurses. If hostilities were declared terminated today, if the war were declared over today, 6 months thereafter you would not have one nurse, I venture to say, in the Army or the Navy, because they could not live on the pay scale, and the only way they can exist today is by reason of emergency legislation which raises the pay to a living standard.

We recognized that terrible deficiency and that terrible probability. That is

the reason we have brought in a bill which will take care of any unforeseen situations such as that. To the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] we owe a great debt of gratitude for her contribution, and as for the gentleman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] I need not tell you what she has done. The Army will have a minimum of probably 2,558 nurses, and the Navy around 2,200. The ratio, as my distinguished chairman has told you, in this bill is 6 to every 100. It will have to be measured on a percentage of the ultimate strength of the Army and the Navy, and it will be a sliding scale, and as it naturally goes up or the minimum goes down, the number will be measured accordingly.

I should like to read an excerpt on this subject from the Army and Navy Journal, which has long followed this probability, in the event that hostilities were declared over. This was prepared February 8.

Prompt congressional action on the bills giving the nurses of the Army and Navy permanent commissioned status is urgently demanded in order that the armed forces may retain in their postwar establishments the services of those professional women whose skill and efficiency was so strikingly demonstrated in the active theaters and in the zone of the interior throughout the war. It was a significant as well as a gracious gesture on the part of Chairman W. G. ANDREWS (Republican, New York), of the House Committee on Armed Services, when he yielded to Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON (Republican, Ohio) the prerogative (usually reserved for the chairman) of introducing the War Department's proposed draft of a bill to revise the Medical Department, which bill carries the provisions for the nurses. Mrs. BOLTON is not a member of the committee, but she is an ardent advocate of giving proper recognition and status to the service nurses and in the last session severely criticized the War Department for its failure to submit recommendations in time for action before the expiration of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Another Congresswoman, Representative MARGARET CHASE SMITH (Republican, Maine), is chairman of the subcommittee, which this week began hearings on the reorganization of the Nurse Corps of both the Army and Navy. Thus, with the collaboration of Mrs. SMITH and Mrs. BOLTON a sympathetic consideration is assured. The record of the services' nurses has been such a sparkling page in the history of the war, one marked by all the admirable traits of bravery, efficiency, sympathy, patience, and humaneness, that it seems the measures for their betterment must merit universal support. But it is speed that is now needed, for day by day war-experienced, capable nurses are accepting discharge from the Army and Navy and seeking to establish themselves in civilian positions while there is still such universal demand for their professional abilities. Many of these would rather stay in the armed forces if they were assured that their future career is safeguarded, that they will be eligible for retention, and that their present commissioned status, now held only by virtue of emergency legislation, will be retained. To help keep these fine women, the committee should assure, in the bill that it approved, that those nurses who served capably and efficiently in Reserve status through the war will be eligible for permanent commissions in the Regular Establishment and that there will be no arbitrarily low age limit set to bar now those who were of the proper age when they first entered on active duty.

Mr. Speaker, when we passed legislation last year giving the Veterans' Administration authority to hire nurses the wage scale was way up, so much so that we unwittingly caused a raid on nurses so that the Army and the Navy were by virtue of that law not able to retain these nurses. We have to do something to retain these experienced, patriotic women who contributed so terribly much in that time of dire need in our country's emergency.

I know this bill will not need very much debate, and I am sure it will merit your consideration and will pass. It is unanimously reported, and has the backing of the entire committee.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. What was the gentleman reading from a moment ago that contained the reference to the gentleman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton]? Was it the committee report?

Mr. RIVERS. It was the Army and Navy Journal.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is what we might well call emergency legislation, because if it is not enacted into law, since the war emergency is over all the nurses in both the Army and the Navy will revert back to their prewar status, where the minimum pay was \$1,080 a year and the maximum \$1,800 a year. In order to retain the nurses in the service during the war period we had to give them temporary commissioned rank. With that rank, of course, came the commissioned rates of pay, subsistence allowances, and all the benefits the commissioned officers in the Army and the Navy received. The purpose of this bill in establishing the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps as well as the Navy Nurse Corps is to give them permanent rank so that some inducement may be offered to the women of this country who are willing to offer their services to the military branches of this Government so that they will at least be given some recognition along the same lines as we give commissioned officers in both the Army and the Navy. We must keep in mind that unless this bill becomes law, as the term of enlistment of these women expires they are going to go back into the more lucrative practice in private life, where the opportunities are so much greater than they will be in the military branches of the Government.

If we say to the nurses in both the Army and Navy today, "After your term of enlistment has expired, you go from the commission pay down to what we call the prewar pay of \$1,080 a year to \$1,800 a year, we are simply not going to have any nurses stay in the military service of our Government." In order to recognize their ability, we must give them not only the same relative rank that they enjoyed as commissioned officers of both branches of the service, but we must also give them the same rate of pay, emoluments, subsistence, retirement benefits,

and all the other benefits that we now give the commissioned men in both the Army and Navy.

At the present time we are informed by the Navy Department that they are approximately 1,000 Navy nurses short of their requirements, and that the Army is 1,500 nurses short of their requirements. As the terms of service of these nurses expire, it will simply increase the shortage to a point where a real danger arises which will affect the welfare of the men and women who are still in the military services. This matter has been very thoroughly discussed in subcommittee over a period of a number of weeks. We have gone into every phase of this whole subject matter and have had the benefit of experience to guide us in recommending this legislation to the Congress in order to take care of this emergency which is facing the military forces. As a result of that study and thorough consideration, the legislation was sponsored by both the Army and Navy and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

We have brought in a unanimous report not only from the subcommittee considering this legislation but also the Armed Services Committee of the House. I hope and trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the House will unanimously approve this bill in the interest of safeguarding the health of our men and giving an inducement to the young women of the country who have the necessary qualifications to offer their services so that we may meet the requirements of our military branches.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy Members are present; not a quorum.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 13, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, March 13, 1947.

Business to be considered: Executive session. Conference with officials of the Railroad Retirement Board, the Treasury Department, with respect to the Bureau of Internal Revenue on railroad retirement funds and the Federal Security Agency with respect to the Social Security Board on railroad retirement funds, pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Friday, March 14, 1947.

Business to be considered: Executive session. Conference with officials of the Department of Commerce with respect to the Bureau of Standards, the Weather

Bureau, and the Inland Waterways Corporation pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, March 18, 1947.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 2109, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; also public hearing on H. R. 2324, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Friday, March 14, 1947, at 10 a. m., Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin hearings on the following measures, with respect to war and emergency powers:

H. R. 1933, to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

House Concurrent Resolution 5, to declare the date of termination of the wars in which the United States has been engaged since December 7, 1941.

House Concurrent Resolution 9, to declare December 7, 1946, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in, and as the date of the termination of, the present war.

House Concurrent Resolution 25, to declare the date of termination of the wars in which the United States has been engaged since December 7, 1941.

House Joint Resolution 56, to terminate the emergency war powers of the President.

House Joint Resolution 128, to declare July 4, 1947, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war.

House Concurrent Resolution 21, providing that various titles of the Second War Powers Act of 1942 shall remain in force until the day following the adoption of this resolution.

The hearings will be conducted in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

There will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary on Monday, March 17, 1947, on the following bills:

H. R. 1468, to provide for the review of certain orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the United States Maritime Commission and giving the United States courts of appeals jurisdiction on review to enjoin, set aside, or suspend such orders.

H. R. 1470, to provide for the review of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture made under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended.

The hearing will begin at 10:30 a. m., and will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Full committee meeting 10 a. m., Thursday, March 13, 1947, 213 House Office Building, to consider H. R. 2408, postal rates. Open hearings.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Friday, March 14, 1947, at 10 a. m., Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H. R. 120, H. R. 695, and H. R. 1883,

to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II. The hearings will be conducted in room 345, House Office Building.

On Wednesday, March 19, 1947, at 10:30 a. m., in room 346, old House Office Building, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin hearings on the following measures with respect to holidays and celebrations:

H. R. 147 and H. R. 316, making the 14th day of August in each year a legal holiday, and for other purposes.

House Joint Resolution 1, House Joint Resolution 11, House Joint Resolution 23, House Joint Resolution 41, House Joint Resolution 63, House Joint Resolution 65, and Senate Joint Resolution 41, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

House Joint Resolution 31, providing for the observance of October 11, 1947, as General Pulaski Memorial Day.

House Joint Resolution 12, requesting the President to declare November 10, 1947, a day for the observance of the creation of the United States Marine Corps.

House Joint Resolution 15, designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week.

House Joint Resolution 20, designating period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading.

House Joint Resolution 35, designating the second Sunday of October of each year as Grandmother's Day.

House Joint Resolution 46, authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775.

House Joint Resolution 60, designating September 17 of each year as Constitution Day.

House Joint Resolution 64, designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day.

House Joint Resolution 82, designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day.

House Joint Resolution 88, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

House Joint Resolution 94, requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day.

House Joint Resolution 100, designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-Ins' Day.

H. R. 1051, designating the first Monday of October in each year as National Farm Day and declaring such day a legal public holiday.

H. R. 1193, declaring August 14 of each year a legal holiday.

H. R. 1981, declaring Good Friday in each year a legal holiday.

H. R. 2085, designating the fourth Saturday in September of each year as American Indian Day.

H. R. 2333, declaring the birthday of Abraham Lincoln to be a legal holiday.

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Lands on Thursday, March 13, 1947, at 10 o'clock, in room 1324, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 49, Hawaii statehood.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Committee on Banking and Currency will meet at 10 a. m. Thursday, March 13, 1947, in the committee room 1301, New House Office Building, to conclude its hearings on the rationing and extension of price control of sugar.

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, at 10:30 a. m., on Friday, March 14, 1947, in the committee rooms, suite 356, old House Office Building.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Public Lands on Saturday, March 15, 1947, at 10 o'clock, in room 1324, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 1098, H. R. 1099, H. R. 1146, H. R. 1148, H. R. 1150, H. R. 1217, H. R. 1337, H. R. 1483, H. R. 1484, H. R. 1487, H. R. 1539, H. R. 1727, H. R. 1784, H. R. 2353.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands on Monday, March 17, 1947, at 10 o'clock in room 1324, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 1772, H. R. 1886, and H. R. 1997. This meeting is scheduled each day through Friday, March 21, 1947.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m. Thursday and Friday, March 20 and 21, 1947.

Business to be considered: Public hearings on H. R. 873 and H. R. 1823, to create an Enemy Property Commission.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

446. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department under provisions of section 2 of Public Law 649 (79th Cong., 2d sess.), approved August 7, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

447. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Director of the United States Geological Survey to produce and sell copies of aerial or other photographs and mosaics, and photographic or photostatic reproductions of records, on a reimbursement of appropriations basis; to the Committee on Public Lands.

448. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a resolution of the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., petitioning the Congress to authorize the transfer to the municipality of certain lands owned by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Lands.

449. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of fiscal affairs of Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

450. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of its activities and expenditures for the month of August 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

451. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of its activities and expenditures for the month of September 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

452. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

453. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the use of Freedmen's Hospital appropriations for certain expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### 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. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1369. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, for the purpose of making section 3 thereof permanently effective; with amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. House Joint Resolution 118. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry; with amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1358. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOWE: Committee on Armed Services. House Joint Resolution 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; with amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2184) to amend section 304 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; Committee on Banking and Currency discharged, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

A bill (H. R. 2190) to provide that schools constructed under the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other

purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, may be donated to local school agencies; Committee on Banking and Currency discharged, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2513. A bill to increase the compensation of the Governors of Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2514. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1945, by changing the basis of award of merit for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System from 2 years of service to 1 year of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2515. A bill to promote on the retired list officers and enlisted personnel of the Army commended for gallantry in the performance of duty in actual combat in World War I or II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2516. A bill to authorize the erection of additional facilities at the existing Veterans' Administration facility, Fort Miley, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 2517. A bill to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2518. A bill to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 2519. A bill to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2520. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2521. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2522. A bill to provide certain limitations on penalties or liabilities arising out of Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and certain other acts, when the violations on which such penalties or liabilities were incurred were not willful; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2523. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2524. A bill to provide for the succession to the Presidency, and to provide for a person to act as President in case of the failure to qualify of both President-elect and Vice-President-elect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2525. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the

inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2526. A bill to increase the amount of deduction allowed with respect to medical and dental expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2527. A bill to remove the monthly maximum placed on the income of veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital to be constructed in St. Louis, Mo., as the John J. Cochran Memorial Veterans Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 143. Resolution directing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation with respect to (1) the exclusion of Negroes as patrons of the public portions of the restaurants and cafeterias in the United States Government buildings in the District of Columbia, and (2) the exclusion of Negro employees as patrons of the restaurants and cafeterias in the United States Government buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2528. A bill for the relief of Anastasio A. Ylagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 2529. A bill to suspend deportation of Domenico Marrazzo and record his admission for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2530. A bill for the relief of Jeannette C. Jones and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2531. A bill for the relief of Nicholas G. Niedermiller, Peter A. Beklemishev, and Nicholas M. Tikmenev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2532. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Wexler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2533. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 2534. A bill for the relief of James H. Underwood; 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:

184. By Mr. MILLER of California: Petition of Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County, State of California, urging defeat of any measures interfering with the basic democratic rights of the people of this Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

185. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Pittsburg, Calif., urging defeat of any measures which might interfere with the basic democratic rights of the people of this Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

186. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of residents of Odessa, Tex., asking abolition of OPA; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

187. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Pastor del Rio, chairman of the democratic committee of the house of representatives, Habana, Cuba, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to an organization of a conference of representatives of the American legislative bodies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Great is the Lord and greatly to be praised; with rapture we meditate upon Thy measureless mercy. So long as there is a sun to drive away the darkness; so long as there is a bird to sing away the sadness of the human heart; so long as there is a wanderer wearing the scarred image of the Father, so long is there a redeeming love in the heart of our world's Saviour.

O Light Divine, our way is dim, uncertain, and perilous. We beseech Thee, these fateful days, to light up the plains of peace; to hover over this sin-wrought earth, struggling to be free because of distrust, ignorance, and low ambitions. Whatever is done in this Chamber, grant that those God-given rights—the right to live and work, the right of self-assertion, the right to worship—may be upheld. O safeguard us that we may never forfeit these blessings, which were wrought by sacrifice, toil, and death.

With Thy presence, Lord, O Thou bless our President; keep him in the circle of divine love and care, and restore him in rest to his urgent duties. In the name of 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. Frazier, its legislative clerk, 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. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILEY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. McCARRAN, and Mr. EASTLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1968) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."